Acc. 8240

Vol. 2 Pt. 2

LIST OF CONTENTS.

Section 1.—General Remarks ... ... 299—
„ 2.—Means of Subsistence... ... 300—315
„ 3.—The Observances of the accomplished student ... ... 316—321
„ III.—The five sacrifices ... ... 322—326
„ 4.—The Agnihotra and the Darsha-Purnamasa ... ... 327—329
„ 5.—The Harvest Sacrifice... ... 330—334
„ 6.—Attending upon guests ... 335—340
„ 7.—Duties of the accomplished student: Sources of wealth ... ... 341—343
„ 8.—Personal cleanliness ... ... 344—382
„ 9.—Gifts not to be accepted .... 383—385
„ 10.—Daily Duties ... ... 386—388
„ 11.—Vedic Study ... ... 389—392
„ 12.—Days unfit for study ... ... 393—409
„ 13.—Other Duties ... ... 410—478
„ 14.—Charity ... ... 479—484
„ 15.—Avoid Pious Vanity ... ... 485—
„ 16.—Accumulate Spiritual Merit ... 486—488
„ 17.—Relationships and connections ... 489—490
„ 18.—Accepting of Gifts ... ... 491—496
„ 19.—Control of Speech ... ... 497—498
„ 20.—End of the Householding stage ... 499—500
„ 21.—Summing up ... ... 501—

5a39
Man, ik

A-x
13120

DISCOURSE IV

DUTIES OF THE HOUSEHOLDER: MEANS OF LIVELIHOOD.

SECTION (1)—GENERAL REMARKS.

VERSE I

HAVING DWELT, DURING THE FIRST QUARTER OF HIS LIFE, WITH THE TEACHER, THE BRĀHMAṆA SHALL, DURING THE SECOND QUARTER OF HIS LIFE, LIVE IN HIS HOUSE, AFTER HAVING TAKEN A WIFE.—(1)

Bhāṣya.

The first verse sums up in brief what has gone in the last two discourses, for the purpose of recalling it to the mind; and the second verse serves to indicate that among the Duties of the Householder this prescribes the means of livelihood.

Inasmuch as the extent of 'life' of man is uncertain, any rule regarding the 'quarter' of life becomes incompatible; hence the present verse is to be taken as stating only the period of life that has been allocated to the various stages of life. Though the rule might somehow be justified on the basis of the assertion that 'man lives for a hundred years,' yet our Author has himself laid down other kinds of limit; *e.g.*, with regard to studentship he has said that 'it may extend till the Veda has been got up' (3.1); and in connection with the limit of the stage of the Householder also, it has been said (6.2)—'when the Householder finds etc.;' and from all this it follows that the present verse is to be taken simply as the reiteration of the said limits.

'*The first quarter of his life.*'—This is regarded as 'first,' counting from the man's birth.

'*Having dwelt with his Teacher,*'—*i. e.*, having accomplished his studentship;—'*during the second quarter of his life,*'—he shall marry, and '*live in his house*';—*i.e.*, lead the life of the Householder.—(1)

'*Without causing trouble to the body.*'—Service and Trade are sources of great suffering to the body, involving as they do long journeys and other troubles : so that these should be avoided.

'*Accumulation.*'—Collecting and keeping.—(3).

VERSE IV

HE SHALL LIVE BY "TRUTH" AND "NECTAR," OR BY "DEATH" AND "SUPER-DEATH;" OR, EVEN BY "TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD;" BUT NEVER BY THE "LIVING OF THE DOG."—(4)

Bhāṣya.

The author now mentions the "occupations" by name; and their mere names imply the excellence of some of them; and from this it follows that one should have recourse to the deprecated ones only when the commended ones are not possible.

Of these, the "Death" and the "Super-Death" are the most deprecated; and worse than these is the "Truth and Falsehood," as is clear from the fact that the Text says that one may live '*even* by these;' where the term '*even*' clearly indicates undesirability.—(4)

VERSE V

GLEANING AND PICKING IS TO BE KNOWN AS "TRUTH;" AND WHAT IS OBTAINED UNASKED, "NECTAR"; ALMS OBTAINED BY BEGGING IS "DEATH," AND CULTIVATION IS DECLARED TO BE "SUPER-DEATH."—(5)

Bhāṣya.

The corn that is gleaned is to be known as 'Truth;' living by this means being regarded as equal to the strict observance of truth. When after harvesting, corn is being carried either home or to the granary, if certain ears of corn fall down on the ground, and are left by the owner,—the picking up of these is what is called "gleaning;" and this is called 'Truth;' and in regard to this, one need not entertain any

such idea as 'this belongs to another person, so I shall not take it.'

Similarly, when one takes away what has fallen off from the sheaf—either before or after harvesting,—and what forms part of several offshoots,—this is 'picking.'

'*What is obtained unasked is Nectar*'—so called, because it is a source of great pleasure.

'*The alms obtained by begging is Death.*'—The term 'begging' itself signifying the fact of what is obtained being 'alms,' the addition of this latter term—which is formed by the adding of a Nominal Affix denoting a *group* or *collection*,—is meant to imply that several persons shall be begged, and no single person shall be constantly troubled, as is shown by what has been said above regarding 'what involves very little trouble to living beings.' Then again, as a rule, the term '*bhaikṣa*,' 'alms,' is found to be used in the sense of *cooked food*; as we find in the case of such passages as—'for the purpose of cleansing oneself from *alms*;' hence the adding of the term 'begging' serves to indicate that 'alms' stands here for *food in general*; hence what is meant here is not *cooked food* only; specially as for one who has set up the Fire, it would be wrong to make the *Vaishvadeva* and other offerings with food cooked in any other fire.

The begging of alms here spoken of is not meant to be that only which is got for eating; it stands for what enables the man to maintain himself; and the maintenance of the householder is not accomplished merely by eating; in fact, it requires all such things as are necessary for housekeeping; hence it is that water-vessels and other such articles should also be begged; as also such household-requisites as dishes and covers, etc. So far as the Student is concerned, since for him it is impossible that just at the time of his eating, cooking should be done in the proper manner,—it follows that in his case 'alms' must mean *cooked food* only.

The term '*bhikṣā*,' 'alms,' also indicates the quantity of the article obtained by begging; this quantity being a mere *handful*. But when a man is begged, he does not give mere alms, a mere handful; so that the begging of the cow, gold and such other things could not be regarded as sanctioned by the mere 'handful.' In fact, begging is always done for the purpose of receiving all kinds of gifts.

"The receiving of *alms* also would be a receiving of gifts."

No; mere acceptance does not constitute the 'receiving of gifts;' the root '*graha*,' with the preposition '*prati*,'—*i.e.*, the term '*pratigraha*,' 'receiving of gifts'—is applied to a particular form of 'acceptance,' and not to any and every *acceptance*. Wherever the term '*pratigraha*,' 'gift,' is used—*e. g.*, under 4.186 and 10.100—it is used in the sense of such *gift* as is offered with a view to some transcendental result, and is received with due *mantras*. In the receiving of mere '*alms*,' however, there is no reciting of any such *mantra* as '*dēvasya tvā, etc.*' Nor again, is the term applied to the accepting of friendly and other presents; in the sense of this latter, the term is never used.

From all this it follows that the terms 'Truth' and 'Nectar' are used in the sense of things other than 'gifts.' Hence, in this case, the man who gives, whether begged or un-begged, is a high-souled person, and, hence, in his mind there does not arise any desire for any form of return (for the gift he makes); so that there would be no grounds for any restriction as to the caste, etc., of the recipient or giver. When a present is made entirely through sympathy for the receiver, it does not become a 'gift' (which always connotes the presence of desire for some transcendental result).

"But what is given through sympathy or pity is also conducive to transcendental results."

We say—no; because it does not fulfil the conditions of '*dāna*,' 'giving' (formal); it being prompted either by

pity or by the desire to do good to others. Hence, just as in offering advice, through sympathy, considerations of caste do not come in; so in the case of giving through pity also. It is for this reason that in the case of such giving, cultured people do not observe any such restrictions as 'gifts should be offered to the Brāhmaṇa who knows the real meaning of the Veda,' and so forth. It is for this same reason, again, that even non-Brāhmaṇas, on becoming poor, accept gifts offered by others, but are not, on that account, regarded as having 'received gifts,' and thus transgressed upon the Brāhmaṇas 'livelihood.'

The conclusion, therefore, is as follows:—Though in the regular '*gift*,' considerations of its being *asked* or *unasked* do come in, yet it does not, merely on that account, become either 'Truth' or 'Nectar;' because it has been shown that these terms have a different connotation.

This same connotation is applicable to 'officiating at sacrifices' and 'teaching' (the other two means of livelihood for the Brāhmaṇa): Some one obtains the post of officiating at a sacrifice after having begged for it from some one. Similarly with the work of Teaching also.

Any such means of living as is obtained by begging, involves humiliation; and hence, resembling death, it is called 'death.'

Cultivating is worse even than Death; specially as the act of ploughing and carrying of burdens is the work of lower people.—(5)

VERSE VI.

TRADE IS "TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD;" EVEN BY THAT ONE MAY LIVE. SERVICE HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE THE "LIVING OF DOGS;" HENCE ONE SHOULD AVOID IT.—(6)

Bhāṣya.

It should not be understood that the scripture here lays down the fact of Trade being both 'true' and 'false;' it only

superiority of merit leads to superiority of reward—'*he is a superior winner of worlds*'—he wins the wolrds ; *i.e.*, takes possession of them, as their master ; *i. e.*, obtains them for his enjoyment. The suffix '*tama*' denotes *excellence.* In the absence of qualifications, the term 'worlds' here is taken as standing for the *heavenly regions.*

For these reasons, the rule on this point would be as follows:—

(*a*) He who has vast responsibilities, having many children, whose sons have not set up separate houses, who has not married away his daughters,—such a person should possess a granary full of corns;—(*b*) he, however, who has become advanced in age, has got children, has done all that he had to do,— such a person, as he goes on withdrawing from activities, should have recourse to the other alternatives.—(8)

VERSE IX

FROM AMONG THESE ONE FOLLOWS THE SIX OCCUPATIONS ; ANOTHER LIVES BY THREE ; ONE AGAIN WITH TWO ; WHILE THE FOURTH LIVES BY "BRAHMASATTRA.'—(9)

Bhāṣya.

'*From among these*'—from among the four kinds of householders, one having a granary full of grains, and so forth,—'*one follows the six occupations* ;' *i. e.*, the person with vast responsibilities described above, follows all the six occupations.—"Which are these?"—These are—(1) gleanings, (2) pickings, (3) earning by begging, (4) earning without begging, (5) agriculture and trade ; 'teaching,' officiating at sacrifices' and 'receiving gifts' being included under 'earning by begging, and without begging.' The man with a large family should have recourse to all these occupations, for the due fulfilment of his daily work ; in fact he may have recourse to even agriculture and trade.

Some people explain the 'six occupations' of the present context as standing for—'Teaching, studying' and the rest mentioned in Discourse I (88). But this explanation is in-

compatible with the context [since *Study*, *offering of sacrifices* and *making gifts* cannot be 'means of livelihood']; and further, there would be no point in prescribing *study* and the rest here, they having been already enjoined elsewhere (in 1.88 and in 10.75).

'*Another*'—the second, who possesses a jar full of corns—'*lives by three*;' the prefix '*pra*' in '*pravartatē*' is superfluous; '*pravartatē*' standing for '*vartatē*.' Any three occupations of those mentioned are meant here,—with the exception of Agriculture and Trade.

The person possessing only a jar full of corns is more commendable than the former. Since it is going to be declared later on that—'this means of living has been deprecated by the good;' this with reference to the 'tending of cattle, trade,' and so forth (8.102). Gautama has mentioned (10.5-6) 'Agriculture and Trade, not carried on by oneself, and money-lending' as permissible in normal times. But even when one carries on trade and agriculture, not by oneself, but through others,—there is something improper in this also; though the impropriety may be a small one.

'*One lives with two*.'—Here also, leaving off 'earning by begging,' any two of the six may be adopted. The acquiring of wealth *without begging* also is permissible only to the extent of what may suffice for three days.

'*The fourth lives by Brahmasattra*.'—'*Brahmasattra*' stands for either one of the two, 'picking' and 'gleaning.' These means of living are called '*sattra*' (Sacrificial Session), because they are carried on continuously and are not to be finished on any one day. For this reason they are called '*sattra*,' specially as they have to be carried on every day. The term '*brahma*' is synonymous with '*Brāhmaṇas*;' the meaning being that this is a sacrifical session for Brāhmaṇas. From the use of this term '*brahma*' here, it follows that all that has been said before this regarding the means of living, pertains to '*Brāhmaṇas*;' those pertaining to

the *Kṣattriya* and others will be described on various occasions.

Question—"How can any living be possible by *pickings* and *gleanings* alone? since it is only during the autumn and the summer that it is possible for ears of corns to fall either in fields or in harvest-yards. It might be said that 'the man would earn summer-grains from the summer-harvests, and the autumnal grains from the autumnal harvests.' But in this way the man would have to collect grains lasting for six months; and he could never be 'one who does not possess enough for the morrow.' It might be argued that—'it would be possible for the man to pick and glean grains that may have fallen here and there (even apart from harvesting).' This is true; but the grain collected in this fashion could never suffice for feeding.—'When the man is picking and gleaning, just as he will have collected enough, he will eat; it being impossible for him to make a collection for five or more days. In the Mahābhārata, the person who eats at the end of a fortnight has been called 'one who lives by pickings and gleanings;' which means that, under such circumstances, the Householder has become the Hermit.'—But even so, this would be incompatible with the character of 'one who does not possess enough for the morrow;' as, under the circumstances mentioned, the man would be 'one who lives upon whatever he obtains,' and *not* 'one who does not possess enough for the morrow.' That man is called 'one who does not possess enough for the morrow,' who earns everyday just enough for the day, and spends it all on the same day, and does not keep anything for the next day. If the daily 'picking and gleaning' does not suffice for his daily feeding, how could he be 'one who does not possess enough for the morrow?' How could such a person live and maintain his wife and children?"

It is in view of these difficulties that some people offer another explanation of the Text beginning with the words

'*another lives by three*':—'*By three*'—*i.e.*, by officiating at sacrifices, by teaching and by receiving gifts.—'*By two*'—*i.e.*, by officiating at sacrifices and by teaching; the 'receiving of gifts' being precluded in view of what is said (in 10.109) regarding 'the receiving of gifts being demeaning.'—'*Brahmasattra*' is *teaching*; and this would be enough for a living. The person described (in 4.10) as 'one who lives by picking and gleaning, etc.,' must be different from the four described in the present text.

On this point, we offer the following explanation:—'*The person living by picking*' is one who obtains from several persons—taking ten or twelve barley grains from each—just enough to serve for the day; while one who obtains from each person enough for the day is called 'one living by gleanings.' In another *Smṛti* text, this means of living has been called '*Yāyāvara.*' In view of this, such livelihood may pertain to all time. Nor would there be any incompatibility between the performance of the *Vaishvadeva* and other rites and the maintaining of wife and children; as for purposes of the former, a very small quantity would be taken out of the alms obtained.—(9)

VERSE X

'LIVING BY GLEANINGS AND PICKINGS, INTENT UPON THE PERFORMANCE OF AGNIHOTRA, ONE SHOULD CONSTANTLY OFFER ONLY THOSE IṢṬI-SACRIFICES THAT PERTAIN TO THE MOONLESS AND FULL-MOON DAYS AND TO THE SOLSTICES.—(10)

Bhāṣya.

The term '*pārvāyaṇāntīyāḥ*' is to be expound as 'those pertaining to the *Parvas* and the *Ayanāntas*;'—the term being formed with the reflexive 'aṇ' and the correlative '*chha*' (according to Pāṇini, 4-2-114).

'Iṣṭi-sacrifices pertaining to the *Parvas* (the moonless and the full-moon days) are the *Darśa-pūrṇamāsa* sacrifices; and that 'pertaining to the solstices' is the sacrifice called the '*Agrayaṇa.*'

The adding of '*only*' precludes the voluntary sacrifices that are performed with special ends in view. For the man here referred to, the offering of the *Vaishva-deva oblations* and the making of *Bali*-offerings are not necessary every day; because he does not possess the requisite amount of wealth. Hence the term '*only*' precludes all the more elaborate sacrifices.

"For that same reason, the *Agnihotra* also would not be possible for the man; as wealth is needed for that also."

Yes; but he could offer the fortnightly oblations.

"How would such a man maintain his wife?"

She also will have recourse to the same means of living (*i.e.*, picking and gleaning). In the event of the wife being disabled and unable to carry on this method of livelihood, the husband would not be entitled to the performance of the *Agnihotra* (or to the livelihood by pickings and gleanings).

"How would the wife, in such cases, manage to live, when the man would be keeping the *Chāndrāyaṇa* and such other fasts and observances?"

There is no room for this question, in face of the direction that 'the wife shall eat what is left by the guest and others.'

"In the event of the man not being able to offer the *Vaishvadeva*-offerings, the wife could not live upon her own private property; as it has been laid down that both husband and wife shall live upon 'remnants.' Hence, the man shall make the *Vaishvadeva*-offerings with the help of his wife's property; specially, as the use of the wife's property for religious purposes has been sanctioned by the scriptures."

It is not so; under the circumstances mentioned, it is the *Agnihotra*, and not the *Vaishvādeva*-offering, that is religiously binding.

Or, even granting what you say. How would that woman live who has no private property of her own?

From all this it follows that the man, whose wife is disabled, is not entitled to have recourse to the 'picking and gleaning' method of livelihood.

'*Living*'—maintaining himself.—(10)

VERSE XI

HE SHALL NEVER FOLLOW THE WORLDLY WAY, FOR THE SAKE OF SUBSISTENCE; HE SHALL LIVE THE STRAIGHTFORWARD, SINCERE AND PURE LIFE OF THE BRĀHMAṆA.—(11)

Bhāṣya.

That is called the '*worldly way*' which is followed by ordinary people wanting in moral strength;—such methods, for instance, as those of hypocrisy and flattery—(describing the man from whom something is to be gained as) 'you are Viṣṇu, you are Brahmā! May you conquer and live long!,' and so forth,—and also of reciting pleasing and jocular stories.

'*For the sake of subsistence.*'—What is mentioned here should not be done for the purpose of making a living; there is no harm in its being done by way of politeness.

'*Straightforward.*'—The man whose exterior is different from the interior, is called 'dishonest,' 'not straightforward;' such a person is of a jealous temperament and shows it to persons who speak disagreeable words to him.

'*Sincere.*'—That man is called 'insincere,' 'hypocritical,' who performs the *Agnihotra*, for obtaining popularity and thereby receiving presents and gifts, and not with a view to carrying out the scriptural injunctions regarding it.

Though 'straightforwardness' and the rest are qualities belonging to the soul, yet they are here figuratively attributed to the 'Life.'

'*Straightforward, sincere and pure.*'—The 'purity' here meant consists in its not being mixed up with the two methods of livelihood described above, and also in its being free from the aforesaid defects.

Though what was meant could be conveyed by means of only one of the three words, yet, in view of metrical exigencies, the author has made use of three words; such use being analogous to such expressions as '*go-balīvarda*' (where the *go* is the same as the *balīvarda*).

"How can there be any such expression as '*live the life of the Brāhmaṇa*,' '*Brāhmaṇajīvikām jīvēt*,' when the root *to live* is intransitive? Why, too, should the same root (*to live, jīva*) be used twice (once in '*jīvēt*' and again in '*jīvikām*')? Certainly, the relation of cause and effect is never found to be expressed by such expressions, as '*gamanam gachchhēt*,' 'should *go* the *going*.'"

Our answer is as follows:—The relation of cause and effect is based upon the relation of general and particular, and hence there is nothing incongruous in this. We have such usage in expressions like '*ashvapoṣam puṣṭaḥ*,' 'fattened like the fattening of the horse.' Further, the root '*jīva*,' 'to live,' also denotes the act of *living* as part of the act of *acting up to* the *performance*; and in this sense it is *transitive* also. So that there is nothing objectionable in the expression used; the term '*jīvēt*,' '*should live*,' being explained as '*should act up to*,' for the sake of subsistence.—(11)

VERSE XII.

HE WHO WANTS HAPPINESS SHOULD ADOPT PERFECT CONTENTMENT AND REMAIN SELF-CONTROLLED. HAPPINESS HAS ITS ROOT IN CONTENTMENT, AND ITS OPPOSITE IS THE ROOT OF UNHAPPINESS.—(12)

Bhāṣya.

With a view to laying stress upon the importance of the two means of living—'to collect grains for three days' and 'not to possess grains enough for the morrow,'—the author adds this verse by way of reflection.

One should have recourse to contentment; that is, one should not make an effort to go about begging on a large scale, with a view to becoming dependent upon several persons.

'He who wants happiness should remain self-controlled.'—*'Self-control'* consists in not wanting more wealth than what would suffice for bare subsistence.

'Contentment' is the root of happiness for all high-minded persons; and its opposite—*i.e.*, Discontent—is the root of unhappiness; the non-accomplishment of what is desired being a source of great humiliation for the learned. For these reasons, one should have recourse to contentment.—(12)

3

SECTION (3)—THE OBSERVANCES OF THE ACCOMPLISHED STUDENT.

VERSE XII.

THE TWICE-BORN ACCOMPLISHED STUDENT, LIVING BY ANY ONE OF THESE MEANS OF LIVELIHOOD, SHOULD KEEP THESE (FOLLOWING) OBSERVANCES, WHICH ARE CONDUCIVE TO HEAVEN, LONGEVITY AND FAME.—(13)

Bhāṣya.

The term '*means of livelihood*' stands for the rule regarding subsistence. Hence, '*by any one*' does not imply that the man's life should be entirely dependent upon that one; because the rules do not say that he who has recourse to one living should not have recourse to another. It is for this reason,too, that the man subsisting by a number of means of living, or the man who has inherited his father's property (and hence does not stand in need of the modes of living just described), does not cease to be entitled to the keeping of the observances. If this were not so, then it would be absolutely necessary for the man to adopt only *one* mode of living.

'*These observances.*'—'Observance' means *mental determination*, in the form—'such and such an act is enjoined by the scriptures,—I should do this—or I should not do that.'

'*Conducive to heaven, longevity and fame.*'—Some people have held that this mentions the results actually following from the keeping of the observances; and hence it is only persons desiring these results, that have to keep the observances.

This, however, is not right. As if this were so, then the observances would cease to be obligatory; and this would be incompatible with the term '*nitya*,' 'daily,' 'always,' occurring in the next verse. Further, the Veda has indicated the obligatory character of these observances:—'By not keeping these, one becomes beset with sin.' Further, if Heaven and the rest were construed as something desired,

they could not attain the position of being qualifications of the persons entitled to the observances.—(13)

VERSE XIV

HE SHALL, WITHOUT SLOTH, ALWAYS PERFORM HIS OWN DUTY AS PRESCRIBED IN THE VEDA PERFORMING THAT, TO THE BEST OF HIS ABILITY, HE ATTAINS THE HIGHEST STATE.—(14)

Bhāṣya.

'*Prescribed in the Veda.*'—This is said in view of the fact that the Smṛtis are all based upon the Veda.

'*His own duty.*—'Consisting of the host of observances going to be described. Being prescribed for him, they are called '*his own.*'

'*Should always perform.*'—*i e.*, as long as he lives.

'*Without sloth*'—*i.e.*, free from laziness.

By doing this—*i.e.*, by keeping the observances,—'*to the best of his ability*;'—this implies that one is to perform just what he has the strength to perform. It is in view of this that it has been declared that—'one may also observe all this mentally only.'

'*Highest state*'—*i.e.*, attainment of Brahman.—(14)

VERSE XV

HE SHALL NOT SEEK WEALTH BY CLINGING PURSUITS, OR BY CONTRARY ACTS; NOR WHEN WEALTH IS ALREADY THERE; NOR FROM HERE AND THERE, EVEN IN TIMES OF DISTRESS.—(15)

Bhāṣya.

'*Clinging pursuits*' are those to which people become addicted; just as singing and music; to these passionate persons *cling*, as it were. Hence one shall not 'seek'—*i.e.*, earn wealth by means of singing and music.

'*Contrary act*'—*i.e.*, that which is forbidden by the scriptures, or is not in accordance with the usages of one's family.

'*Nor when wealth*'—enough for subsistence—'*is already there*'—having been inherited from father and others;—one shall not seek for more,

'*Even in times of distress, not from here and there.*'—As a rule, one should subsist on presents received from proper persons ; but, in rare cases, the scripture shall permit a contrary course also, in times of distress.—(15)

VERSE XVI

HE SHALL NOT, THROUGH DESIRES, BECOME ADDICTED TO ANY SENSUAL OBJECTS ; EXCESSIVE ADDICTION TO THESE, HE SHALL AVOID BY MENTAL REFLECTION.—(16)

Bhāṣya.

'*Sensual objects.*'—Objects of sense, colour, taste, and the rest ;—'*to these he shall not become addicted,*'—*i.e.*, he shall not attend to them too much. Lovely young girls, sounds of flute and music, sweet taste, perfumes of camphor and other things, loving touch,—all these one shall not enjoy over much.

'*Through desire*'—*i.e.*, by reason of the predominating influence of desire.

In regard to all these, one should keep one's own enjoyment under proper check ; just in the same manner as one keeps one's desire for wealth under check, by restricting one's earnings only to what one gets without begging.

'*Excessive addiction to these.*'—This points out the method of restraining one's desires. Attachment to objects cannot be checked by the mind ; it can be checked by reflecting upon them as inimical to one's best interests. At first, one should not seek to obtain them ; and when they do come to one, and one has enjoyed them once, one should reflect upon the following facts relating to them :—These are such that in a moment they cease to be agreeable,—they are transient,—they are forbidden by the scriptures,—attachment to them leads to hell, and so forth. This is what has been already said under 2.96 above.—(16)

VERSE XVII

HE SHALL RELINQUISH ALL THINGS IMPEDING STUDY, MAINTAINING HIMSELF SOMEHOW. THIS IS WHAT CONSTITUTES THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF HIS AIMS.—(17)

Bhāṣya.

Those things that are likely to obstruct Vedic study should all be relinquished; such acts, for instance, as attending upon the palaces of kings and ministers; as also the act of being overmuch addicted to worldly affairs, constantly thinking of earning more and more wealth by means of money-lending and such other means, and thereby maintaining his family, and obtaining a prosperous household teeming with male and female slaves.

'*This constitutes the accomplishment of his aims*'—*i.e.*, of the Accomplished Student. The fact that, carrying on his daily study of the Veda, he maintains his family by some means or other, constitutes his highest success in life.—(17)

VERSE XVIII

HE SHOULD WANDER ABOUT IN THIS WORLD, KEEPING HIS DRESS, SPEECH AND THOUGHTS IN CONFORMITY WITH HIS AGE, OCCUPATION, WEALTH, LEARNING AND FAMILY.—(18)

Bhāṣya.

'*Vayasaḥ,*' '*with age,*'—the genitive ending denotes relationship to 'conformity.'

'*Veṣavāgbuddhi.*'—this is a copulative compound.

'*Sārūpyam.*'—the affix '*ṣyan*' has the reflexive force.

Thus the meaning comes to be as follows:—

Dress and the rest should be kept in due conformity with age and other things. '*Sārūpya,*' means here *conformity, compatability*; any other kind of '*Sārūpya,*' 'similarity,'—such as that of figure and the like—being impossible in this case.

'*Dress*' stands for the disposition of the hair, of ornaments, and so forth. For instance, during boy-hood, hair is to be worn in tufts; during youth, it shall be worn in curls

and such other shapes; while in old age it shall be either worn clotted, or shall be clean shaven.

'*Speech*' also should be in conformity with age. Similarly, '*thoughts*' also; that is, during early life the man should think of the triad (of wealth, pleasure and religious merit); but as he grows old, his thoughts should rest mainly on Religious Merit.

Dress should also be in conformity with one's occupation, as also with one's wealth; it should be in conformity with one's family also. So that such things as painting of the teeth and dressing of the hair, etc., even though otherwise flagrant, cease to be so when they are in keeping with one's occupation, etc.

It has been said that the present verse deals with ordinary worldly activity. That is to say, it does not lay down an Injunction;—the injunctive portion of it having been already got out from other sources. All that the verse does is to describe the ordinary usage of the world; the sense being that if one behaves in accordance with this, one follows the ways of the world, and hence does not become unpopular among men.—(18)

VERSE XIX.

HE SHALL ALWAYS PORE OVER SUCH TREATISES AS QUICKLY ENLIVEN THE INTELLIGENCE, ARE CONDUCIVE TO WEALTH AND ARE BENEFICIAL,—AS ALSO OVER THE VEDIC SCRIPTURES.—(19)

Bhāṣya.

'*As enliven the intelligence,*'—*e.g.*, Itihāsas, Purāṇas, Treatises on the Science of Reasoning, and also those written by Bṛhaspati, Ushanas and others.

'*Beneficial*'—productive of benefit; *i.e.*, leading to perceptible desirable results; such for instance, as the Sciences of Medicine and Astronomy; — the Science of Polity being mentioned separately (under those 'conducive to wealth').

'*Vedic Scriptures.*'—This term stands here for those sciences that are helpful in understanding the meaning of the Veda; such sciences for instance, as those of Exegesis, Etymologies, Grammar and Interpretation,

If the term stood for the Vedic texts themselves, these would be conducive to imperceptible (and not perceptible) results.—(19).

VERSE XX

FOR, AS THE MAN GOES ON STUDYING A SCIENCE, SO DOES HE GO ON UNDERSTANDING, AND THEN HIS KNOWLEDGE SHINES FORTH.—(20)

Bhāṣya.

'*Study*' here stands for *application*, repeated reading. '*Understands*'—*i.e.*, when one studies a treatise repeatedly, one comes to comprehend fully what is contained in it.

'*Then his knowledge shines forth*'; —*i.e.*, becomes bright.

This verse states the reason for the foregoing verse.

The root '*ruch*' governs the Dative only when it is used in the sense of 'longing for ;' and, as it does not convey that meaning here, we do not have the Dative.—(20.)

SECTION III—THE 'FIVE SACRIFICES.'

VERSE XXI.

TO THE BEST OF HIS POWER, HE SHALL NEVER OMIT THE SACRIFICE TO THE SAGES, THE SACRIFICE TO THE GODS, THE SACR?FICE TO ELEMENTALS, THE SACRIFICE TO MEN AND THE SACRFIICE TO THE PITṚS.—(21)

Bhāṣya.

The sacrifices prescribed in Discourse IV are reiterated here for the purpose of laying down details in connection with them ; these details shall be described in the next verse.

Others think that the reiteration of these sacrifices under the 'observances' is for the purpose of establishing their obligatory character ; so that the man shall form the determination that 'so long as I continue to be a householder, I shall not omit the Five Great Sacrifices.'

In any case, we should not entertain the idea that these have been mentioned twice for the purpose of enjoining them twice over. Because, in the present verse, we do not find any injunctive word ; all that is said is that 'he shall not omit ;' and, as a matter of fact, this 'non-omission' is already implied by the obligatory character of the sacrifices. And since we recognise in these sacrifices the same that have been enjoined before, there is no reasou why they should be regarded as distinct acts.

'*To the best of his power*'—*i.e.*, with cooked food, or with uncooked food, or with fruits and roots.—(21)

VERSE XXII.

SOME PERSONS, CONVERSANT WITH THE ORDINANCES RELATING TO SACRIFICES, WHO DO NOT CHERISH ANY DESIRES, REGULARLY OFFER THESE GREAT SACRIFICES INTO THE SENSE-ORGANS.—(22)

Bhāṣya.

'*Some persons*'—Householders—'*Conversant with the ordinances relating to sacrifices, offer these great sacrifices into the sense-organs*;' *i.e.*, they accomplish their performance in this manner.

Who are these people?

'*Those who do not cherish any desires*;'—*i.e.*, those who have no desire for acquiring wealth, who have renounced the Vedic rituals.

Some people regard this verse as enjoining what is to be done by the person living on 'pickings and gleanings,' as also by the lame and the maimed. That such persons also may marry wives is going to be declared later on in 9-20. Such persons are not entitled to the regular performance of the Five Sacrifices; for the simple reason that they can never possess wealth sufficient for the performance of the sacrifices; since they are to earn only enough for subsistence, and not any more than that, which could be used in the performance of sacrifices.

The root '*hu*' (in '*juhvati*,' 'offer,') indicates the act of *doing* in general. For the 'sacrifice,' which is a particular act, can never be the object of '*homa*,' which is another act; there can be no such expression as 'cooks the cooking;' we have such expressions as 'does the cooking,' 'does the sacrifice.' It is only when verbs stand in need of objects in general that they get, for their auxiliaries, substances and their operations; *e.g.*, we have such expressions as 'desires to eat,' 'he is able to eat,' 'know to eat;' and the particular (the part) is often found to be used as indicative of the general (the whole), when, for instance, one speaks of 'the ox' as to be examined 'by its foot.'

Some people explain the 'offering into the sense-organs' to mean their *restraining*.

Others, again, have explained it to mean what has been described in the Upaniṣad (Chhāndogya), where it is said that

the first mouthful that one eats in the morning and in the evening, should be put into the mouth as an 'oblation,' with the formula '*prāṇāya svāhā*,' and so forth.

Others, again, explain that the 'offering' here spoken of is the same as what is enjoined in the next verse as a form of 'worship;' and it is thus that the two verses become construed together.

"But, in the next verse, the life-breath is laid down as to be offered into speech, and not into the *sense-organ* (as in the present verse)."

There is no force in the objection. The mention of the 'sense-organs' simply indicates the spiritual character of the offering; what is meant is that this offering does not require any external accessories.—(22)

VERSE XXIII.

SOME PEOPLE CONSTANTLY OFFER THEIR LIFE-BREATH INTO SPEECH, AND THEIR SPEECH INTO THE LIFE-BREATH,—KNOWING THAT IN SPEECH AND IN LIFE-BREATH RESTS THE IMPERISHABLE FULFILMENT OF SACRIFICES.—(23)

Bhāṣya.

Whenever a man breathes, he should think—'I am offering speech into Life-breath;' and when he speaks, he should think—'I am offering Life-breath into Speech.' By this alone the Five Sacrifices become accomplished.

"If these are obligatory, they should not be spoken of as leading to any results."

As a matter of fact, only such persons are entitled to this form of sacrifice as are cognisant of the real nature of the Soul.

This same fact has been laid down in the Upaniṣads, in connection with 'the worship of the Five Fires,' and in great detail in the *Kauṣitaki Brāhmaṇa.*

'*Imperishable*'—in their results; their results consisting in non-return to the cycle of birth and rebirth.—(23)

VERSE XXIV

OTHER BRĀHMAṆAS, LOOKING, WITH THE EYE OF KNOWLEDGE, UPON THIS ACT AS HAVING ITS ROOT IN KNOWLEDGE, ALWAYS SACRIFICE WITH THESE SACRIFICES, BY MEANS OF KNOWLEDGE.—(24)

Bhāṣya.

'*By these sacrifices,*'—by the Five great sacrifices under treatment—'*they sacrifice,*'—*i.e.,* accomplish their duty in relation to them. It is in this sense that there is difference in the denotations of the two terms, 'sacrifice' and 'sacrifices,'—between which the text speaks of the relation of cause and effect ; just as we have in the expression, 'he who sacrifices with the *Agniṣṭoma* sacrifice.'

Question:—"How can the *sacrifice* be accomplished by means of *knowledge* ? *Sacrifice* consists in the act of offering a certain material for the benefit of a deity ; and certainly *knowledge* is not of the nature of such an act."

Our answer is as follows:—By the term 'sacrifice' in the present verse what is meant is *the accomplishment of the act of sacrificing.*

"If such accomplishment were brought about by *knowledge* alone, for what purpose would there be the performance of the act itself ? The performance of an act cannot be entirely objectless. If your idea be that—'since the Veda speaks of the reward of an act accruing also to the man having *knowledge* of it, there is no need of the actual performance at all,'—this cannot be right ; as the passage referred to is only a commendatory description subserving the purposes of some other passage."

To this we make the following reply :—We have already pointed out that the persons entitled to the performance of the sacrifices in question are those that have realised the true nature of the Soul and are entirely free from desires. And it is these persons that are spoken of as 'possessing

knowledge,' and not those who have the knowledge *of the act*. What the present text means is that such persons, having given up the Veda, but continuing in the house, should accomplish the great sacrifices in this manner. That is to say, it is only by means of knowledge of the Soul that such persons can accomplish such sacrifices as can be performed only with the help of wealth (which these men have renounced); but, as regards the two duties of Teaching and offering water-libations, it is going to be declared in Discourse VI, that these can be accomplished only by the actual performance of the acts (and not by knowledge of the Soul).

The text adds a commendatory declaration, by way of pointing out the reason for what has been said above. '*Having its root in Knowledge*,'—*i.e.*, that act which has its root in Knowledge. Knowledge stands at the root of all acts; an ignorant person cannot perform any act at all. This is what has been said in such passages—as—'the learned man sacrifices.'

'*Looking with the eye of Knowledge*.'—The Knowledge being as if it were the Eye; just as colour is perceived bymeans of the eye, so is the matter known by means of knowledge. '*Knowledge*' here does not stand for the *Veda* alone—(24).

SECTION (4).—THE AGNIHOTRA AND THE DARSHA-PURNAMĀSA.

VERSER XXV.

HE SHALL ALWAYS OFFER THE AGNIHOTRA, EITHER AT THE BEGINNING, OR, AT THE END, OF DAY AND NIGHT, AS ALSO THE "DARSHA" AND THE "PAURṆAMĀSA" AT THE END OF EACH HALF-MONTH.—(25).

Bhāṣya.

The terms '*agnihotra*' and the rest are found used in the Veda and in the Gṛhyasūtra texts, in the sense of particular rites; and these rites, along with their procedure, are prescribed in these texts. And it is to these rites that the present verse makes a *reference*; it does not contain the origianl injunction of the rites; specially, as it speaks of their *form* only; *i.e.*, all that the present verse mentions is the necessity of performing the act of *offering* only,—and it does not mention either the material to be offered, or the deity to whom it is to be offered. And yet the names '*Agnihotra*' and the rest, stand in need of the mention of detailed particulars; hence it follows that what is implied is that the detailed particulars of these rites are to be learnt from other treatises.

"If that be so, then, since the necessity of performing the rites also could be learnt from those same treatises, there is no use for the present text at all."

The use of the present text lies in adjusting the necessity of performing these acts, in the case of persons who have renounced Vedic rituals, with the form of worship laid down in the present context; the sense being that just as, according to what has been said regarding some people offering 'the life-breath into speech,' and so forth, the Five Great Sacrifices are performed by such men, by means of *Knowledge* alone,—so are the sacrificial rites mentioned in the present verse also. Then again, what sort of objection is this that you urge, when

you ask—'Why should there be a repeated mention?' As a matter of fact, in the case of the Vedic and Smṛti texts, it is found that what is said in one part of it is said again in another part; and all this would be open to objection (according to you). Lastly, we have already provided the general answer to such objections;—*viz.*, that since the persons meant to be enlightened are many, the texts cannot be regarded as needless repetitions at all. Just as, by reason of the perceivers being many, there are many organs of perception, and all men cannot see with one eye only, and there is need of several such organs,—so also is the case with the diverse Vedic and Smṛti texts.

The question might be raised—"Why should the mere name of the rites be mentioned?"

There is nothing objectionable in this also. Since the procedures as laid down in the several Vedic texts are divergent, which particular procedure could the verse mention? If it were to mention all, there would be prolexity; and if it were to mention any *one* only, this would involve the abandoning of the others.

"Even so, the omission is open to objection."

But we have already pointed out that the present verse contains only a *reference*, and not an *Injunction*. It is only an Injunction, against which the objection can be urged that —'the act being already enjoined elsewhere, why should it be enjoined again?'

'*At the beginning and end of day and night*;'—this is not meant to be construed respectively. What is meant is —'at the beginning of day and beginning of night,' and 'at the end of day and end of night;' and by this, *morning and evening* are meant. For those who follow the practice of making the offerings *after sunrise*, the offering shall be made 'at the beginning of day;' while for those who follow the practice of making the offerings *before sunrise*, it shall be made 'at the end of night.'

The term '*dyu*' here is synonymous with '*Dīvasa*,' 'day.'

'*Always*,'—*i.e.*, throughout one's life, one should offer these morning and evening libations.

In connection with '*darshēna*,' it is necessary to supply the root '*yajēta*'; as the original injunction of the *Darsha-sacrifice* does not contain the verb, '*juhuyāt*,'—the injunction being in the form '*darshēna yajēta*;' and the present verse makes only a reiterative reference to what is prescribed in that injunction; and thus (it being impossible to construe '*darshēna*' with the verb '*juhuyāt*' in the verse) it becomes necessary to supply the verb '*yajēta*.' For this same reason, though the text does not make any specification, the phrase, '*at the end of half-month*' should be understood to mean that the *Darsha* is to be performed at the end of the darker fortnight, and the *Paurṇamāsa* at the end of the brighter fortnight. Says the *Shruti*—'One should perform the *Darsha* sacrifice on the Moonless Day and the *Paurṇamāsa* on the Full Moon Day.'—(25)

SECTION (5)—THE HARVEST-SACRIFICE.

VERSE XXVI.

AT THE END OF THE GRAINS, THE BRĀHMAṆA SHALL PERFORM THE "NEW-HARVEST SACRIFICE;" AT THE END OF THE SEASONS, THE "ADHVARA-SACRIFICES;" AT THE END OF THE SOLSTICES THE "ANIMAL-SACRIFICE;" AND AT THE END OF THE YEAR THE "SOMA-SACRIFICES."—(26)

Bhāṣya.

The term '*sasya*,' '*grains*,' stands for the *Vrīhi* and other grains;—'*end*' means *exhaustion*. The meaning is that when the previous supply of grains has become exhausted, he shall perform the 'New-Harvest Sacrifice,' *i. e.*, the *Āgrayaṇa* sacrifice.

This does not mean that either the exhaustion of the previous supply of grain, or the coming in of the new harvest, is the reason or occasion for the performance of the *Āgrayaṇēṣṭi*; what is meant is that the eating of new grain is prohibited, until one has performed the *Āgrayaṇēṣṭi*. This is what has been said in the following text—'Without having offered the sacrifice, one should not eat new grain.' On these grounds, some people explain the verse to mean that 'since one cannot eat new grains without having performed the *Āgrayaṇa* sacrifice, one shall perform this sacrifice.'

But, according to this explanation, it would mean that—if there has been no previous grain-supply, or, if there is no fresh grain-supply, or, if one has no desire to eat new grains, it would not be necessary to perform the *Āgrayaṇa* sacrifice. If the 'end of previous supply' be taken to be indicative of the coming in of the new supply [and there were nothing to prohibit the eating of new grains before performing the sacrifice], then it becomes possible to eat the new grain without having performed the sacrifice.

For these reasons, we conclude that here we have two declarations—(*a*) 'he shall not eat without having performed the sacrifice' (next verse) and (*b*) 'at the end of the grains, &c.' (present verse). The 'end of grains' is meant to stand for the coming of the new grain; since the *coming in* is certain, and as such can serve as the occasion for the sacrifice. The 'end' or 'exhaustion' (of the former supply), on the other hand, is uncertain; since, in the case of rich men, there are supplies that may last for three years. It is for these reasons that the author of the *Sūtra* has declared—'Without having performed the *Agnihotra*, one shall not eat out of the harvest,' and 'When one is satisfied for the year, one shall perform the Āgrayaṇa,'—and, further, 'The new-grain sacrifice is to be done in the autumn;' this last laying down the time for the sacrifice. So that the man, for whom there is no 'end of the former supply,' will observe the rule regarding autumn being the time for the sacrifice; which will not be done by another person (for whom there is 'end of former supply'). In this way, both the declarations are found to have their use. If this were not the meaning, then the author would have said simply—'On the coming of the new harvest, he shall perform the New-Harvest Sacrifice.' Since, however, the author says—'without having performed the New-Harvest Sacrifice, one shall not eat of the new grains,' it follows that even when the new harvest has come in, if the man happen to have old corn left, he may wait till the autumn (for the performance of the sacrifice); and, since the coming in of the new harvest forms the occasion for the sacrifice, the performance of the *Āgrayaṇa* is obligatory, even when the man has no desire to eat new grains.

'*At the end of the seasons.*'—According to the theory that 'the *season* constitutes the *year*,' what this portion of the text lays down is the performance of the *Chāturmāsya* sacrifices; in fact, it is these sacrifices that are referred to by the term '*adhvara*.'

5

'*End of the solstices*' means 'beginning of the two solstices';—the two solstices being the 'northern' and the 'southern.' At these, one shall perform the 'Animal-Sacrifice,' twice during the year. The author of the Sūtra has said—'This sacrifice is either six monthly or yearly.'

'*At the end of the year.*'—The term '*samā*' is synonymous with 'year;' and the 'end' of this is the *shishira*, the later winter season. The present verse does not mean that the Soma-sacrifice shall be performed during the winter; what is meant is that—'when the winter has passed and the spring has arrived, the Soma-sacrifice shall be performed.' Says the *Shruti*—'At each spring-season, one shall perform the *Jyotiṣṭoma* sacrifice.'

What the whole text means is that these constitute the obligatory rites, and, as such, shall be performed, somehow or the other, by even those who have renounced Vedic rituals.—(26).

VERSE XXVII

WITHOUT HAVING PERFORMED THE NEW-HARVEST SACRIFICE, AND THE ANIMAL SACRIFICE, THE BRĀHMAṆA, WHO HAS SET UP THE FIRE, SHALL NOT EAT NEW GRAIN OR MEAT,—IF HE DESIRES TO LIVE A LONG LIFE.—(27)

Bhāṣya.

The term '*Agnimān*' must stand here for one who has set up the Fire; because 'observances' form the subject matter of the context; and it is in connection with the *Agnihotra-homa* that we have 'observances' laid down in the Yajurveda.

Without having performed the Animal Sacrifice, he shall not eat meat, nor shall be eat new grain without having performed the New-Harvest Sacrifice.

The text next describes the reward accruing from the observing of this rule—'*if he desires to live a long life.*' The term, '*āyu*,' 'life,' denotes the function of the out-and-in-breathings operating continuously. Even though the verb,

'to live,' is intransitive, yet we have the accusative ending, in view of the action of 'desiring,'—this act of *desiring* being expressed by the verb ('to live') as ending in the desiderative affix '*san*.' Though, as a matter of fact, the object of the act of 'desiring' is what is denoted by the root to which the desiderative is affixed (*i.e.*, *living*), and not anything outside the desiderative term itself,—and the *desire* is subordinate to *what is desired*,—yet there need be nothing incongruous in the suggested construction, in view of the dictum that 'the basic term and the affix jointly denote what is expressed by the affix'; so that the accusative ending may be attributed to what is expressed by the desiderative word as a whole. According to this view also, the term '*āyu*,' 'life,' would be indicative of a period of *time*, the meaning being 'if he desires a life lasting for a long time.' So that the accusative would be due to the dictum that 'in the case of intransitive verbs, the time-period may be regarded as an object.'

This rule, relating to the man with the Fire performing the Animal Sacrifice, applies to the case of the *Āgrayaṇa* sacrifice also. Because the Gṛhya texts have prescribed the *Āgrayaṇa* as an obligatory rite for one who has only the domestic fire.

As for the rule that 'the New-Harvest Sacrifice is to be performed in the autumn,' this refers to the *Vrīhi* and the *Shyāmāka* grains, not to the *Yava*. Nor is it necessary to perform the Harvest-Sacrifice at each and every harvest; nor is it performed with such grains as the *Māṣa*, the *Mudga*, and the like. That all this is so follows from the fact that the present text is dependent upon other scriptural injunctions, and it is not itself a self-sufficient injunction, as we have already explained. And in other scriptural injunctions it has been laid down that the *Āgrayaṇēṣṭi* is to be performed with the *Vrīhi*, the *Shyāmāka* and the *Yava*.

Though this is so, yet other grains also should not be eaten, until the *Āgrayaṇēṣṭi* has been performed; since it has been stated in general terms that 'he shall eat *no new grains*;' and if the author had meant to prohibit the eating of only those grains with which the *Āgrayaṇēṣṭi* is performed, then he should have said—'He shall not eat the *Vrīhi*, the *Shyāmāka* and the *Yava*, until he has made the offering;' while what the author of the *Sūtra* has said is—'The Āgrayaṇa is to be performed with the *Vrīhi*, the *Shyāmāka* and the *Yava*; *one shall eat no new grains* until one has made the offering;' so that the term '*grain*' cannot stand for any particular grains only.—(27).

VERSE XXVIII

FOR HIS FIRES, GREEDY OF NEW GRAINS AND MEAT, SEEK TO DEVOUR HIS VERY LIFE, IF THEY ARE NOT WORSHIPPED WITH NEW GRAINS AND WITH MEAT.—(28)

Bhāṣya.

By pointing out the evils arising from the omission of the said rites, the text indicates their obligatory character.

'*Not worshipped with new grains*,'—not having the oblations offered into them,—'*the fires*'—of the man who has set up the fire,—'*seek to devour*'—eat—'*his very life.*'

'*Greed.*'—'Greed' is excessive *longing*; and one who has this, is called 'greedy.' The affix '*ini*' has the force of the possessive.—(28)

SECTION (6).—ATTENDING UPON GUESTS.

VERSE XXIX

NO GUEST SHALL DWELL IN HIS HOUSE WITHOUT BEING HONOURED, TO THE BEST OF HIS ABILITY, WITH SEAT, FOOD, BED, OR WITH WATER, FRUITS AND ROOTS.—(29).

Bhāṣya.

What is said here has already been said before; it is reiterated here for the purpose of laying down the additional details that follow.

'*No guest shall dwell in his house unhonoured.*'—That is, all guests should be lodged in the house after being honoured.

'*To the best of his ability.*'—One or two, or several,—as many as can be duly honoured—shall be honoured with seat and other things. What is meant is that when guests are living in one's house, all these things should be provided for them, in a respectful manner; it does not mean that one should give away one's proprietary right over all these articles in the house. Since 'fruits and roots' have been mentioned separately, it follows that these are to be given only in the event of other kinds of food, in the shape of rice, juice, meat and butter, being not available.—(29)

VERSE XXX.

HE SHALL NOT HONOUR, EVEN WITH SPEECH, IMPOSTORS, THOSE WHO FOLLOW IMPROPER OCCUPATIONS, THOSE WHO ARE CAT-LIKE IN THEIR BEHAVIOUR, HYPOCRITES, LOGICIANS, AND THOSE WHO BEHAVE LIKE HERONS.—(30)

Bhāṣya.

In view of the implied meaning of the terms 'shall dwell,' people have taken this verse to mean that one shall

not offer shelter, for the night, to the impostor and others, who may happen to arrive in the evening. This, however, is not right; what the present verse does is to forbid the *honouring* of certain persons; and it is not meant that all kinds of food, etc., shall be withheld from them. Even during the day, while people are eating, their presence for a certain time is inevitable; hence the terms, 'shall live,' need not necessarily indicate the time of evening.

Impostors;—those who bear external marks (of religiosity); *e.g.*, wandeing mendicants who go about in red clothing, or naked, and so on

'*Those who follow improper occupations*;'—*i.e.*, those who, even in normal times, live by occupation fit for other castes; *e. g.*, when the *Brāhmaṇa* adopts the occupation of the *Kṣattriya*, or the *Kṣattriya* that of the *Vaishya*, and so forth.

'*Those who are cat-like in their behaviour*;'—*i.e.*, those who perform the Agnihotra and other rites, for the purpose of winning popular esteem, hoping to obtain gifts of dwelling, &c., thereby,—and not because such rites are their duties prescribed by the sciptures.

'*Hypocrites*,'—whose thoughts are different from their speech; *e.g.*, having promised to help some one, they disregard him, and do not do anyting at all.

'*Logicians*,'—*i.e.*, atheists, those who entertain such notions as 'there is no other world, there is no good in charity, nor in sacrificial offerings.'

'*Who behave like herons*.'—These also are *hypocrites*, with a slight difference from those mentioned before; this differene between the two shall be shown later on.

'*Even with speech*;'—to say nothing of offering the seat, &c.; they are not to be even respectfully welcomed with such words as 'please come.' The mere giving of food is meant to be sanctioned, just in the manner in which it is given to low-caste persons. The revered Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana has

declared, with reference to the giving of food, as follows—'One shall not stop to enquire about his birth or learning;' which means that in the giving of food one should not enquire after the qualifications of the recipient.—(30)

VERSE XXXI

HE SHALL HONOUR WITH OFFERINGS TO GODS AND TO PITṚS, THOSE VEDIC SCHOLARS, WHO HAVE BECOME ACCOMPLISHED IN THE VEDA, IN LEARNING AND IN THE OBSERVANCES, AS ALSO HOUSE-HOLDERS; HE SHALL, HOWEVER, AVOID THOSE WHO ARE OTHERWISE.—(31)

Bhāṣya.

The '*Veda*,' '*learning*,' and the '*observances*,'—'*those who become accomplished*' in these,—*i.e.*, those who have completed their course of training in these. There are several kinds of 'accomplished students.' Of them those who have studied the Veda are called 'accomplished in the Veda;' those who have satisfied their thirst for learning, are called 'accomplished in learning;' on account of the proximity of the term 'Veda,' the 'learning' meant here is *Vedic* learning; especialy because, as a matter of fact, that alone is real learning. The '*observances*' are those that have been detailed under 3·1 *et seq.*

There is this view also that the final 'bath' (signifying *accomplishment*) cannot be taken, merely on the completion of the learning of the Veda and its meaning; the full period of thirty-six years (or, other alternatives) has to be gone through.

Others have explained that the term 'accomplished in the observances' stands for those who, without having studied the Veda, take the final 'bath' after three years.

But this view is absolutely untenable; since there can be no 'bath' for one who has not learnt the Veda.

Objection:—"Why should the text add the term *Vedic scholars*;' this qualification being already implied by the epithet '*accomplished*?"

Answer :—The term has been added for the purpose of laying stress upon the fact that those persons are meant who still keep up their study of the Veda.

'*Householders*.'—This does not mean that the mendicant, the ascetic and the student are not to be honoured ; all that is meant is that, since all these live upon *alms*, they cannot be regarded as 'guests ;' especially as the student cannot dwell anywhere else except at his teacher's house, and the ascetic cannot dwell away from the forests. For the Renunciate also, dwelling in villages is not possible, since it has been distinctly declared that 'he shall go to the village only when seeking for alms' (Gautama, 3. 14). From all this it follows that, in view of the fact that persons in the other stages of life live in places other than 'households,'—even though it be somehow possible for them to have the character of 'guests,' —what is said here can apply to *householders* only, *as a rule*.

'*With offerings to Gods and to Pitṛs*.'—That is, these persons are to be received and honoured at the performance of rites in honour of Gods and of Pitṛs.

'*Otherwise*.'—Those who are not 'accomplished,' should be avoided, even though they be free from the aforesaid defects (described in 30).—(31)

VERSE XXXII

THE HOUSEHOLDER SHALL GIVE AS MUCH AS HE CAN TO THOSE WHO DO NOT COOK THEIR OWN FOOD ; AND, FOR THE SAKE OF ALL LIVING BEINGS, HE SHALL MAKE APPORTIONMENT, WITHOUT DETRIMENT (TO HIMSELF).—(32)

Bhāṣya.

'*Those who do not cook their own food*.'—Students and Renunciates are meant,—say some.

But this is not right, as gifts to students and hermits has already been laid down as an obligatory duty. Hence, what is meant by the present text is that one shall give as much

as one can to the poor and also to impostors (who are unable to cook for themselves). That is, his giving shall be in due consideration of what he can give and of the quantity of food cooked in his house. Since the recipients are described as doing no 'cooking,' it follows that *cooked food* is to be given to them.

'*Apportionment.*'—He shall distribute out of his other belongings also,—such as fuel, clothing, medicines and other useful things.

'*Among all beings.*'—The term 'beings' stands for all living things in the world; just as it is used in such declarations as '*gāyatri* is all this *being.*' Since inanimate beings cannot be helped in the same manner as living beings, this term here stands for *conscious, living,* beings only. Thus, according to the view that plants are capable of growing and endowed with consciousness, it would follow that some apportionment of wealth should be made for providing for the watering of plants, &c., also.

The term '*bhūta,*' '*being,*' has many meanings: (1) In some cases, it means *the principal thing, e.g.,* in such expressions as 'this Brāhmaṇa woman is *the being* in this house;' (2) sometimes it means '*ghost*;' *e.g.,* 'this person is obsessed by a being;' (3) sometimes it means the *contrary thing*; *e.g.,* 'he says, what is *bhūta*;' (4) sometimes it is used in the sense of the past,—*e.g.,* 'this verb denotes the *bhūta*;' (5) sometimes it stands for particular deities,—*e.g.,* 'offering to the *bhūtas*;' (6) sometimes it stands for all conscious beings,—*e.g.,* 'one should not kill *bhūtas*;' (7) sometimes it denotes *approach,*—'our Moon is *bhūta,* become, large;' (8) sometimes it denotes similitude,—*e.g.,* 'this is *kāvya—bhūta,* as if it were a poem;' and (9) sometimes it means *coming into existence,—e.g.,* 'Devadatta's son is *bhūta,* born.' What the term means in the present context we have already explained.

The Dative ending in '*bhūtebhyaḥ*' denotes '*for the sake of.*'

'*Without detriment*;'—so that no suffering be caused to his own family; that is, he shall keep back enough for his own family, and then, with the remainder, he shall 'make the apportionment.' This is what is taught also in 11-10.—(32)

A.M.
13120

SECTION (7)—DUTIES OF THE ACCOMPLISHED STUDENT: SOURCES OF WEALTH.

VERSE XXXIII

SUFFERING FROM HUNGER, THE ACCOMPLISHED STUDENT SHOULD SEEK FOR WEALTH FROM THE KING, OR FROM ONE AT WHOSE SACRIFICIAL RITES HE OFFICIATES, OR FROM HIS PUPIL; AND NOT FROM OTHERS; SUCH IS THE RULE.—(33)

Bhāṣya.

The term '*king*' here stands for all wealthy castes; as the author is going to declare later on (10-113)—'The king should be begged by persons suffering from want and seeking for wealth and metals.' Thus the term '*rājan*,' '*king*,' in its primary denotation signifies the *Kṣattriya* caste; but on the strength of what we see in other treatises, we take it to mean here the 'king of men,' specially, as kings of men are wealthy. Thus, what the text means is that—'gifts' should be received from such persons as are extremely rich in the possession of cows and bulls, goat and sheep, cash and grains. In doing this, the man shall be also observing the rule that 'he should live without causing pain to any one;' as such people do not feel any pain in making gifts; while if one were to beg from men with small wealth, it would be open to objection.

If the term '*rājan*' were taken in its primary sense of the *Kṣattriya caste*, the receiving of gifts from *Brāhmaṇas* and others would become forbidden; and this would be against the teaching of all *Smṛtis*. In another *Smṛti*, we read—'One shall receive gifts from commended twice-born people, and uncooked food also from a *Shūdra* who is submissive.' In prohibitions also, we find the term '*rājan*' used in the sense of 'king of men;' *e.g.*, in such passages as—'One shall not

accept gifts from the Rājā,' where the prohibition cannot apply to the *Kṣattriya caste,* since the text subsequently adds —'or from one not born of *Kṣattriya* parents' (4·84). It is for this reason that this latter verse cannot be taken as forbidding the acceptance of gifts from the Kṣattriya, because, if that were meant, the text could not add 'from one not born of Kṣattriya parents;' for those 'not born of Kṣattriya parents' can never be 'Kṣattriyas.' For these reasons, the conclusion on this point is as follows :—'gifts shall be accepted from such Kṣattriya kings' as behave according to the scriptures, and not from others.'

'*From one at whose sacrificial rites he officiates, or from his pupil.*'—The Genitive ending is used in reference to the 'wealth.' Or, we may read the phrase as ending with the 'Tasi affix'—*yājyāntēvāsitaḥ.*' Since both these names are based upon the doing of certain acts, the meaning is that—'he shall live by the occupations of Teaching and Officiating at Sacrifices.'

Others explain as follows :—The receiving of gifts from others would constitute a minor sin, and other means of acquiring wealth, such as theft and the like, are distinctly forbidden. The upshot is that he shall worship God and live upon gifts made through love, and also by pronouncing '*svasti*' (at sacrificial performances) ; but in no case shall he do service ; as that means of livelihood has been already forbidden. Thus he may accept gifts from such of his sacrificial clients as have received benefit at his hands, even though he may not be officiating at their sacrifices at the time ; for even though the actual relationship (of priest and client) may have ceased, their duty towards each other remains.

'*Suffering.*'—This means that gifts shall not be sought, if the man has inherited some property; as it has been declared (in verse 15 above) that—'nor when wealth is already there.'

What is said here is not something to be done in abnormal times of distress; as mere 'suffering' does not constitute 'distress;' all that it means is 'absence of earned wealth;' and it would be a case of 'distress,' only if the adopting of any of the sanctioned means of living were impossible, or if all one's property were destroyed. Even though he may be possessed of much cash and grains, his grain-supply may become exhausted in times of famine; and, in such cases, if entertainment as a guest would be impossible, and the man would be suffering from hunger, this would constitute 'distress;' while, if the man were not pining from hunger, this would be simple 'suffering.' Such is the difference between the two (*distress* and *suffering*).

'*Not from others.*'—That is, he shall receive no gifts from persons with little wealth, or from one who receives no benefit from the person (begging).—(33)

VERSE XXXIV.

THE ACCOMPLISHED BRĀHMAṆA SHALL NOT, IF HE CAN, SUFFER FROM HUNGER; NOR SHALL HE WEAR TORN OR DIRTY CLOTHES, SO LONG AS HE HAS ANY PROPERTY.—(34).

Bhāṣya.

If he happen to fail in some attempt at acquiring wealth, he shall not, at once, have recourse to methods permitted during abnormal times; on the contrary, he should try again and again; this is what has been said in 4·13. Consequently, if the man is a cultivator, and his crops have withered for want of grain, he should not, merely for this, at once have recourse to living upon others, or to begging.

So long as he can, and so long as he has property, torn and dirty clothes shall not be worn.—(34)

SECTION VIII—PERSONAL CLEANLINESS.

VERSE XXXV.

KEEPING HIS HAIR, NAILS AND BEARD CLIPPED, SUBDUED, WEARING WHITE CLOTHES, PURE, — HE SHALL ALWAYS REMAIN ENGAGED IN VEDIC STUDY, ALSO IN WHAT MAY BE CONDUCIVE TO HIS WELFARE.—(35)

Bhāṣya.

'*Clipping.*'—This clipping, or 'shaving of the lips'—is necessary. By this the man becomes '*pure,*' as the text says. If a man wear long hair, bathing becomes a difficult process, and the man is likely to be lazy on that account; and would thus remain 'impure.' If, however, even though wearing long hair, he is careful about his bath, then the wearing of hair would not be objectionable.

'*Subdued*'—free from haughtiness.

'*Pure*'—in all matters; and also purified by the right use of such means of cleanliness as clay, water, mouth-rinsing, and so forth.

He should be always engaged in the study of the Veda. Though this has been already said before, yet it is repeated again and again, in order to show its great importance.

'*What is conducive to his welfare.;*'—*i.e.*, the avoiding of illness by remedies, and also by guarding against indigestion, untimely meals, heavy and hot food, and so forth.—(35).

VERSE XXXVI.

HE SHALL HOLD A STICK OF BAMBOO, AND ALSO A WATER-POT FULL OF WATER, THE SACRED THREAD, A HANDFUL OF KUSHA-GRASS AND A PAIR OF BRIGHT GOLDEN EAR-RINGS.—(36).

Bhāṣya.

The 'holding' of the sacred thread and of the ear-rings, would consist in their being worn on the body; and each of

these should be worn on that part of the body for which it is fitted ; for instance, the ear-rings shall be worn in the ears, and the sacred thread over the body ; the term '*kuṇḍala*,' 'ear-ring,' being the name of the ornament for the ear ; and the name 'sacred thread' being applied to the thread worn over the neck and passing under the right arm.

The stick and the rest are to be always kept on the body, in view of the visible purposes served by them. For instance, the stick serves as a support when the man is tired, and it also serves the purpose of driving away the bull and other aggressive animals.

Inasmuch as 'cleaning' has been laid down as to be done with water taken out of a reservoir, the present text restricts the vessel to the 'water-pot' definitely ; and this precludes the jar and other vessels, which serve the same purpose (of holding water), and not such other things as the ear-ring, the bracelet, and so forth.

Thus it is that the water-pot has to be kept filled with water, for the purpose of removing such uncleanliness as may be caused by contamination during the act of paying the calls of nature, and which is capable of being removed by water. It has been said that—'in matters within one's power, one should not remain unclean for a single moment.' The meaning of the phrase, 'in matters within one's power,' is as follows :— If the water held before has been used up, and then there happens to come about such further uncleanliness as is caused by spitting, and the like, then, if water be not available, there would be no harm in the man remaining unclean for sometime (till he can obtain the requisite water); but even so, in connection with the calls of nature, our author is going to prescribe bathing under 12. 22, where it is laid down that 'the man should dip into water, with all his clothing.'

Precise rules regarding the means of cleaning have been laid down in another *Smṛti* text. Says the revered *Vaśiṣ-*

ṭha (12-15-17)—"For water, hand and wood, Fire has been declared to be the means of cleaning ; hence, having washed the water-pot with the hands and with water, the offering that one makes, has been declared by Manu Prajāpati to constitute *Paryagnikaraṇa* (Fire-purfication). The person knowning the laws of cleanliness should rinse his mouth after having done all necessary acts.'

Bandhayāna also has said—after having begun with the words, 'Now the water-pot is to be held,'—'Having become clean, and when one washes the water-pot, this washing of things constitutes *Paryagnikaraṇa* (Purification by fire) ; even in his previous condition, the man shall leave off the water-pot, on account of its being unclean ; but the learned shall not decry it, nor censure it, nor regard it as objectionable.'

The name '*kamaṇḍalu*,' '*water-pot*,' is based upon the particular shape, and not upon any particular species or kind, of its material. So that, whether it be made of eathernware or of gold, or of silver,—the cleaning, in all cases, is to be done in the manner just described, and in the manner that has been prescribed in connection with the original substance of which it may be made. But, on its coming into contact with urine and such things, the purification is to done in the manner laid down in connection with the constituent material. In all cases, the hands are to be washed, because of their being in contact with such sources of contmination as the man in an unclean state.

Says Gautama also—'Having placed the pot somewhere near him, for the purpose of purification,' *etc.*, *etc.*, So, in the present verse, what is meant by 'holding' is keeping near oneself, and not the actual holding in the hand.

'*Veda*' is the name of 'Kusha-handful.' The use for this consists in the 'touching of the organs,' which has been laid down as to be done with 'Kusha-blades.'

The upshot of all this is that things that serve transcendental purposes shall be held on the body at all times, while those that serve only visible purposes are to be kept only when need arises.

'*Bright.*'—Beautiful, in shape, and also by the burnishing of the gold by heating and polishing.—(37)

VERSE XXXVII.

HE SHALL NOT LOOK AT THE SUN WHEN RISING, NOR WHEN SETTING, NOR WHEN IT IS ECLIPSED, NOR WHEN IT IS IN WATER, NOR WHEN IT HAS REACHED THE MIDDLE OF THE SKY.—(37)

Bhāṣya.

'*Eclipsed*'—Hidden by eclipse.

'*In water*'—Reflected in water.

'*When it has reached the middle of the sky*'—*i.e.*, at midday—one shall not look at the Sun.—(37).

VERSE XXXVIII.

HE SHALL NOT STEP OVER THE ROPE TO WHICH A CALF IS TIED; HE SHALL NOT RUN WHEN IT IS RAINING; HE SHALL NOT LOOK AT HIS OWN FIGURE IN WATER; SUCH IS THE ESTABLISHED RULE.—(38).

Bhāṣya.

'*Vatsatantrī*' is the rope to which the calf is tethered; or, it may mean 'a line of calves.' This '*he shall not step over*'—not cross over. Says Gautama (9.52)—'One shall not pass over the *vatsatantrī.*'

'*Figure*'—shape of the body.

'*Own.*'—The addition of this implies that looking at the figure of other persons is not forbidden.

'*Such is the established rule,*'—ordained in the scriptures—(38).

VERSE XXXIX.

BY A MOUND OF CLAY, A COW, A DEITY, A BRĀHMAṆA, CLARIFIED BUTTER, HONEY, A CROSS-WAY AND THE WELL-KNOWN TREES—HE SHALL PASS IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO LEAVE THEM ON HIS RIGHT.—(39)

Bhāṣya.

This rule applies to cases where, when a man has started to go, the said things happen to come in his way. He should go in such a manner that they remain to his right. Another *Smṛti* has laid down, in connection with depatures, that—'he should walk round rightwards.'

'*Deity*'—as painted on scrolls, for purposes of worshipping. Gautama has declared that—'One shall pass round the temples of gods leaving them on his right;' and, on the strength of popular opinion, the term '*deity*' of the text is to be taken as standing for the temples containing images of the Four-armed *Viṣṇu*, the Sun and other gods;—and the same should be done with sacrificial houses also, as the author is going to declare later on.

'*Madhu*'—should be taken here as standing for *Honey*, on the strength of its being mentioned along with 'clarified butter;' also because it is mentioned in the middle of a number of auspicious things.

'*Well-known trees.*'—Large trees, well known for their great utility and size, or, for the large produce of flower and fruits; such trees, for instance, as the *Udumbara*, and the like. 'The Udumbara is vigour itself,' says a Vedic description.

Some people have explained '*well known*' as 'of superior quality.' But these people have no support for this, except certain popular notions; and they should be ignored.—(39)

VERSE XL.

EVEN THOUGH MAD, HE SHALL NOT APPROACH A WOMAN DURING HER COURSES; NOR SHALL HE SLEEP ON THE SAME BED WITH HER.—(40)

Bhāṣya.

'*Mad*'—even though suffering from the darts of passion.

'*Courses*'—stands for the blood that appears every month in the woman. When this is visible, he shall not approach her. Nor shall he sleep on the same bed with her,

It may be argued that—'the probibition put forward is already implied in the aforesaid prohibtion of touching a woman in her courses.'

But what the present text contains is not a prohibition, but the injunction of a positive observance. And there is a difference in the expiatory rite prescribed in connection with the omission of this observance.—(40)

VERSE XLI.

OF THE MAN WHO APPROACHES A WOMAN COVERED WITH IMPURITY,—INTELLIGENCE, VITALITY, STRENGTH, SIGHT AND LONGEVITY WEAR OFF.—(41)

Bhāṣya.

Impurity—is the same as what has been spoken of above as 'courses.'

'*Covered.*'—connected with.

This verse is supplementary to the preceding verse.—(41)

VERSE XLII.

OF THAT SAME MAN, IF HE AVOIDS THE WOMAN COVERED WITH IMPURITY, INTELLIGENCE, VITALITY, STRENGTH, SIGHT AND LONGEVITY FLOURISH.—(42)

Bhāṣya.

This mention of *flourshing* also is purely commendatory.—(42)

VERSE XLIII.

HE SHALL NOT EAT WITH HIS WIFE; NOR SHALL HE LOOK AT HER WHILE SHE IS EATING, OR SNORING, OR YAWNING, OR SITTING AT HER EASE.—(43)

Bhāṣya

Under 5.130, it is said that 'the mouth of women is always pure,' and again one is advised to avoid 'the leavings of women and Shūdras.' Both of these are true within their own limited sphere. When the mouth is said to be 'ever pure,' it refers to the time of sexual intercourse, in view of what has been declared in another *Smṛti* regarding 'the purity of the woman during sexual intercourse.' From

this it follows that the prohibition applies to such a woman with whom one can never have such intercourse; *e.g.*, the mother, the sister, and the like. Specially because what is prohibited here is not simply *affectionate treatment*, but the entertaining of thoughts of love and longing preceded by the erotic sentiment. Hence it follows that the 'purity' pertains to woman related to such intercourse, and the prohibition to those not so related.

The above considerations would give rise to the notion that one may eat with one's wife, who serves the purposes of sexual intercourse; hence with a view to preclude such an idea, the text proceeds to declare—'*he shall not eat with his wife.*'

"As a matter of fact, what has been said regarding the 'purity' of the woman's mouth, refers to a particular form of advances that the man in love generally makes, so that the purity can refer only to the act of *kissing*; and there is no possibility of its making any one inclined to eat with his wife."

But the reiteration contained in the present verse is meant to show the form of the *observance*; which means that one should make a life-long vow that 'he shall never eat with his wife.'

The 'eating together' that is mentioned here as the object of prohibition is—(*a*) eating out of the same dish, (*b*) eating at the same time and (*c*) eating at the same place. So that there can be no room for the idea that the pohibition applies to 'leavings.' That the meaning of 'eating *together*' is as just mentioned we gather from other Smṛti texts and from usage; as for 'leavings,' this term can only mean what has been left.' Thus, then, when it is said that—'his friends and others he shall feed *with his wife*' (3. 113),—it is clear that what is meant is, *not* that they shall eat out *of the same dish* with the wife, but that they shall eat at the same time and place with her. [Hence, it must be these latter that are forbidden by the present verse].

Others have explained 'leavings' as something different—as what has been left after one has eaten. So that it would not be a case of 'eating the leavings' when one eats in the same dish with one's wife.

According to this explanation, what would be the object of the prohibition would be *the eating with Shrūdas* only; and this would involve the abandoning of universally accepted notions, under which mere touch (of the Shūdra) is regarded as constituting '*uchchiṣṭa*,' 'leaving;' and this touch is present also when two persons are 'eating together.'

Some people hold that what is forbidden is eating at the same time and place; that this is so, follows from the fact that the teaching herein contained is with a view to a visible purpose; the prohibition therefore being based upon the fact that men differ in their nature, some men are not pleased with their wife eating large quantities, while there are others who, on finding their wife eating little, think that she is deceiving him by eating little in his presence.

Similar to the above are the other restrictions: '*He shall not look at her while she is eating*;' if he sees her while eating, when she may be opening her mouth wide, she may look ugly and thus fail to please her husband.

'*Snoring*'—is the sound made by the nose filled with the wind passing down from the head. Here also the disfiguring of the face is likely to make the husband displeased.

'*Yawning*'—the prolonged breathing out of air with the mouth, or the spreading out of the body and limbs. This also is undesirable on the said grounds.

'*Sitting at her ease*'—with hair dishevelled, with the body thrown upon the ground.—(48)

VERSE XLIV.

THE BRĀHMAṆA, DESIRING BRIGHTNESS, SHALL NOT LOOK AT A WOMAN WHO IS APPLYING COLLYRIUM TO HER OWN EYES, OR WHO HAS

8240

ANOINTED HERSELF, OR WHO IS UNCOVERED, OR IS BRINGING FORTH A CHILD.—(44)

Bhāṣya.

One who is applying collyrium to another's eyes, looks beautiful (hence there is no harm in looking at her).

'*Uncovered*'—with her clothing removed. As a rule, men long for looking at a woman only when she is veiled; while, when the woman is undressed, all her limbs become visible, and, on scrutiny, all these may not turn out to be shapely; consequently, one should avoid looking at a naked woman.

'*Desiring brightness.*'—'Brightness' stands for brightness of complexion, as also for energy.—(44)

VERSE XLV.

HE SHALL NOT EAT FOOD WITH ONLY ONE PIECE OF CLOTH ON HIM; HE SHALL NOT BATHE NAKED; HE SHALL NOT PASS URINE ON THE ROAD, NOR ON ASHES, NOR ON THE HAUNTS OF COWS.—(45)

Bhāṣya

Even though the man always wears his sacred thread (and hence, correctly speaking, he is never with only one piece of cloth on), yet, since the sacred thread is always on the body and it does not cover any part of the body, and since the present injunction is apart from the section dealing with Upanayana (where the wearing of the sacred thread is prescribed),—he is regarded as '*having only one piece of cloth on himself.*' What the text means is that, at the time of eating, he shall have on his body a second piece of cloth capable of covering his body.

'*He shall not pass urine.*'—'Urine' here stands for excretions of all kinds.

'*Pathi*'—on the road.

'*On the haunts of cows*'—the path by which cows pass, or the place where they go to graze.—(45)

VERSE XLVI.

NOR ON PLOUGHED LAND, NOR IN WATER, NOR ON AN OVEN, NOR ON A MOUNTAIN, NOR IN A RUINED TEMPLE, NOR ON AN ANT-HILL.—(46)

Bhāṣya.

'*Oven*'—a structure of bricks, for the depositing of fire.

'*Mountain*'—here stands for forests and gardens ; as the mountain-top is going to be specifically forbidden (in the next verse). If the word were really meant to stand for the mountain itself, and the prohibition applied to the mountain as a whole, then people living on the mountains would have to go without passing urine at all.

'*Ant-hill*'—the mound of earth set up by insects.—(46)

VERSE XLVII.

NOR IN HOLES INHABITED BY LIVING CREATURES, NOR WALKING, NOR STANDING, NOR ON REACHING THE BANKS OF A RIVER, NOR ON THE MOUNTAIN-TOP.—(47)

Bhāṣya.

'*Nor walking, nor standing.*'—By the prohibition of passing urine while walking or standing, it is implied that one should pass urine *sitting*. Nor very close to the river, nor in the river itself ; that is to be regarded as 'very close' where there is fear of the urine touching the river.

"Mountain-top"—Peak.—(47)

VERSE XLVIII

ONE SHOULD NEVER PASS FAECES OR URINE, WHILE LOOKING AT THE WIND OR FIRE, OR A BRĀHMAṆA, OR THE SUN, OR WATER, OR COWS.—(48)

Bhāṣya.

What is meant is that one shall not do the act facing the wind ; and the other things he shall not look at, while urinating, even by turning his body towards them. Since *wind* is colourless, its *seeing* can only be ascertained by seeing the flight of leaves, bits of earth and other things waft-

ed by the wind. This prohibition would be incongruous if it applied to the entire *air-circle* (atmosphere); since wind is blowing everywhere.—(48)

As a commendatory supplement to this we have the next verse

VERSE XLIX.

THE INTELLIGENCE OF A MAN PERISHES, IF HE PASSES URINE, FACING THE FIRE, THE SUN, THE MOON, THE WATER, THE BRĀHMAṆA, THE COW AND THE WIND.—(49)

Bhāṣya.

"Since it has been laid down that one should pass urine, facing the north,—and the sun rises in the east,—how can one ever face the sun, in view of which possibility we have the present prohibition ?"

The present verse is a commendatory supplement ; just like the assertion—'not in the sky, nor in heaven, &c.' Then again, during the northern solstice, the sun moving towards the north, it would be possible to face the sun. Or, the prohibition may be taken as meant for the common people (who may not know the rule regarding urinating with face towards the north).

Some people read '*pratisandhyam.*' But this is not right ; because regarding the passing of urine we have the rule that 'during the two twilights it shall be done as during the day ;' and also because the forcible checking of urine, etc., has been forbidden. For these reasons, we should read '*prativātam,*' 'facing the wind.'

This verse is supplementary to the foregoing one.

'*Mēhataḥ*'—may be construed either as ending with the Present-participial affix '*shatṛ,*' or with the affix '*tas*' (having the sense of the Ablative) ; the meaning being—'the man passing urine,' or 'by the passing of urine.'—(49)

VERSE L.

HE SHALL PASS IT AFTER PLACING A STICK, OR A CLOD, OR LEAVES, OR GRASS, OR SOME SUCH THING, RESTRAINING HIS SPEECH, CLEAN, HIS BODY WRAPPED AND COVERED.—(50)

Bhaṣya.

'*Tiraskṛtya*'—'placing between'—the stick, etc.; on that he shall pass urine. Or, '*tiraskṛtya*' may mean 'having covered;' in which case, the meaning would be that 'he should cover the ground with sticks and then pass urine.' In this latter case, the reading with the Insturmental-ending —'*tṛṇādinā*—would be clearer; the construction being—'having covered with sticks or with clods, or with leaves, or with grass.'

'*Pass it*'—i.e., pass urine and evacuate his bowels.

'*Restraining his speech, clean*'—*i.e.*, with mouth not unwashed (not having anything in his mouth).

'*Body wrappea*'—covered with cloth.

'*Covered*'—the head tied up. The rule prescribed is—'with the sacred thread on his ear, etc.'—(50).

VERSE LI.

HE SHALL DO THE PASSING OF URINE AND FAECES DURING THE DAY, WITH HIS FACE TOWARDS THE NORTH; AND AT NIGHT, WITH FACE TOWARDS THE SOUTH; AND AT THE TWO TWILIGHTS AS DURING THE DAY.—(51)

Bhāṣya

'*Samutsarga*'—passing.—(51)

VERSE LII.

IN THE SHADE, OR IN DARKNESS, THE BRĀHMAṆA MAY—DURNING THE DAY OR THE NIGHT—DO IT, WITH HIS FACE TOWARDS ANY DIRECTION HE PLEASES; AS ALSO WHERE THERE IS DANGER TO LIFE, AND WHEN THERE IS FEAR.'—(52)

Bhāṣya

'*Shade*'—i.e., where the sun's rays are shut out by walls or doors, etc.

'*Darkness*'—the obstruction of light by clouds or fogs or eclipses or by night.

'*With his face towards any direction he pleases.*'—He shall pass urine with his face towards that direction which he finds convenient.

This rule pertains to such 'darkness' as makes it impossible for the directions to be determined.

'Danger to life,' and 'fear'—due to thieves, etc.—(52)

VERSE LIII.

HE SHALL NOT BLOW FIRE WITH THE MOUTH ; NOR SHALL HE LOOK AT A NAKED WOMAN. HE SHALL NOT THROW AN UNCLEAN THING INTO FIRE ; NOR SHALL HE WARM HIS FEET AT IT.—(53)

Bhāṣya.

Fire should be blown with deer-skin-fans and such things.

'*He shall not look at a naked woman*'—'apart from sexual intercourse,' says another Smṛti-text.

'*Unclean thing*'—'*amēdhya*—'*medha*' means *sacrifice* ; '*mēdhya*' is *fit for use at sacrifice* ; and '*amēdhya*' is *unfit* for use at sacrifices ; such things, for instance, as onions, urine, excreta, and so forth. Anything like this, he shall not throw into fire.

He shall not raise his feet directly towards the fire and warm them at it. There is no objection to the feet being covered and then warmed for the purpose of exciting perspiration.—(53).

VERSE LIV.

HE SHALL NOT PLACE FIRE UNDER HIMSELF ; NOR SHALL HE STEP OVER IT ; HE SHALL NOT PLACE IT UNDER HIS FEET. HE SHALL NOT DO ANYTHING DANGEROUS TO LIFE.—(54)

Bhāṣya

While lying upon his head, he should not place the fire-pan underneath it. '*Upadhāra*' means *placing*.

'*Stepping over*'—passing along—after having jumped over it.

'*Under his feet* ;'—*i e.*, he shall not place it in a place where he might put his foot upon it.

'*Anything dangerous to life*'—such as too laborious work, or runing with too much force, and so forth ; these he should not do.—(54).

VERSE LV.

AT JUNCTION-TIME, HE SHALL NOT EAT, NOR TRAVEL, NOR SLEEP. HE SHALL NOT SCRATCH THE GROUND; AND HE SHALL NOT REMOVE HIS OWN GARLAND.—(55).

Bhāṣya.

‘*Junction-time*’—twilight.

‘*Sāmvēshana*’—is *sleeping*.

Vedic Study also during twilight is going to be forbidden later on. Another Smṛti has forbidden intercourse with women also, during twilight, *e.g.*—‘At the time of twilight, one shall avoid four acts—eating, sexual intercourse, sleeping and reading.’

‘*He shall not scratch the ground.*’—What is forbidden is the tearing of the ground, and not the writing of letters, &c., with a writing-brush and such things.

‘*He shall not remove his own garland.*’—Flowers stringed together are called ‘garland;’ and when one has placed this upon his head, or on his neck, he himself should not remove it,—either because it has faded or because it is found to be too burdensome. What is meant is that he shall have it removed by another person.

Some people assert that the whole of the verse pertains to the time of twilight.—(55).

VERSE LVI.

HE SHALL NOT THROW INTO WATER URINE, OR FAECES, OR SPITTINGS, OR ANYTHING ELSE CONTAMINATED BY UNCLEAN THINGS, OR BLOOD OR POISONS.—(56).

Bhāṣya.

‘*Lohita*’—Blood.

‘*Poisons.*’—The plural number is used, in view of there being several kinds of poison, which are divided into ‘natural’ and ‘artificial,’ or into ‘moveable’ and ‘immoveable,’ or into the various varieties of ‘*gara*’ and the rest.—(56).

VERSE LVII.

ALONE HE SHALL NOT SLEEP IN A DESERTED HOUSE. HE SHALL NOT OFFER ADVICE TO HIS SUPERIOR. HE SHALL NOT CONVERSE WITH A WOMAN IN HER COURSES. HE SHALL NOT GO TO A SACRIFICE UNINVITED.—(57).

Bhāṣya.

'*Deserted house*'—*i.e.*, one in which no one lives.

'*His superior.*'—One who is inferior, in occupation (learning, wealth, &c.), shall not address to his superior such words of advice as 'this is proper for you,' 'that is improper,' and so forth, accompanied by a statement of reasons and arguments.

'*Udakī*'—a woman in her courses ;—with her he shall carry on no conversation.

'*He shall not go uninvited to a sacrifice,*'—*i.e.*, to a place where a sacrifice is being performed. Gautama has said —'For merely seeing it, he may go, if he desires' (9-55) ; hence the present prohibition pertains to such things as eating and the like at sacrifices, without invitation.—(57).

VERSE LVIII.

IN THE ABODE OF FIRE, IN THE COW-PEN, IN THE PRESENCE OF BRĀHMAṆAS, DURING THE READING OF VEDAS, AT THE TIME OF EATING, HE SHALL UNCOVER HIS RIGHT HAND.—(58).

Bhāṣya.

The term '*goṣṭha,*' '*pen,*' signifies the dwelling-place ; and it is a different word from the compound [*go + sthā*, which means an *abode of cows*, and with which, therefore, the word '*gavām,*' '*of cows,*' would be superfluous].

'*Brāhmaṇas.*'—Significance is meant to be attached to the plural number. [What is prescribed is to be done only when there are many Brāhmaṇas present].

'*Hand*' stands for the *arm.*

'*Eating.*'—When he himself is eating.—(58).

VERSE LIX.

HE SHALL NOT PREVENT A HEIFER WHILE SHE IS DRINKING, NOR SHALL HE POINT HER OUT TO ANYBODY. HAVING SEEN THE RAINBOW IN THE SKY, THE WISE MAN SHALL NOT SHOW IT TO ANY PERSON.—(59)

Bhāṣya.

When a heifer—either his own or some-body's—is drinking water or milk, he shall not prevent her; nor shall he tell of it to another person.

This rule refers to the time before milking. During milking, it has been enjoined that the flow of milk is to be accelarated (by keeping the calf near, and preventing it from sucking).

The feminine gender (in '*dhāyantīm*') implies that there is no harm in preventing a male calf from sucking.

'*Rainbow*';—that which is called '*Śakradhanuṣ*' and '*Vijñanachchhāyā*' in Kashmir. '*In the sky*;'—this is a needless reiteration. But some people have explained that this has been added for the purpose of indicating that there is no harm in seeing and showing the rain-bow when it appears over a mountain.—(59)

VERSE LX.

HE SHALL NOT DWELL LONG IN AN UNRIGHTEOUS VILLAGE, NOR IN ONE ABOUNDING IN SICKNESS. ALONE, HE SHALL NOT UNDERTAKE A JOURNEY; NOR SHALL HE RESIDE FOR LONG ON A MOUNTAIN.—(60)

Bhāṣya.

The village, inhabited by many such persons as have committed sins of varying grades of seriousness, is, by reason of their presence, called 'unrighteous.' In such a village he shall not dwell. The term '*village*' stands for human dwelling-places; hence the prohibition applies to cities also.

A marshy country abounds in sickness; in such a country, and in a desert, which also abounds in sickness, he

shall not dwell. He shall also leave a country where by chance some epidemic might begin to rage.

'*Alone*'—without a companion—'*he shall not undertake a journey.*'—(60)

VERSE LXI.

HE SHALL NOT DWELL IN A COUNTRY WITH A SHŪDRA KING; NOR IN ONE SURROUNDED BY UNRIGHTEOUS PERSONS; NOR IN ONE OCCUPIED BY IMPOSTORS; NOR IN ONE FREQUENTED BY MEN OF THE LOWEST CASTES.—(61)

Bhāṣya.

'*Kingship*' consists in ruling over a country; he shall not dwell in a country which is under the sway of a *Shūdra*. The term 'King' here stands for the seven constituents of Kingship,—*viz.*, the minister, the commander of the army, the judge, and so forth; and the present verse forbids dwelling in a country where all of them belong to the *Shūdra* caste.

Objection:—"It having been already said that he shall not dwell *in an unrighteous village*, what is meant by 'in a country surrounded by unrighteous persons' is already implied."

There is no force in this objection. The former prohibition refers to dwelling in a place *inhabited* by unrighteous persons; while what the present verse means is that one shall not live in a place where unrighteous persons, living elsewhere, may happen to congregate. That is why the text has used the term 'surrounded;' the sense being that 'one shall not stay at a place which is crowded by such persons.'

Similarly with the country swarming with '*impostors.*' Though these also, being outside the pale of 'Vedic religion,' are included among the 'unrighteous,' yet they have been mentioned separately in consideration of the fact that they pretend to be '*righteous.*'

'*Frequented by*'—associated with—'*men of the lowest castes.*' Or, '*frequented*' may mean 'harassed;' *e.g.*, the Bāhlīka country, which is frequently outrun by barbarians.—(61)

VERSE LXII.

HE SHALL NOT EAT ANYTHING FROM WHICH OIL HAS BEEN EXTRACTED; HE SHALL NOT COMMIT GLUTTONY; HE SHALL NOT EAT VERY EARLY IN THE MORNING, NOR VERY LATE IN THE EVENING; NOR IN THE EVENING, IF HE HAS EATEN IN THE MORNING.—(62).

Bhāṣya.

He shall not eat anything from which oil has been extracted; for instance, the oil-cake, juices and meat. Later on (5-24-25), the Author shall provide a counter-exception in the case of sacrificial remnants and preparations of milk kept over-night; and the plural number (in the term '*preparations* of milk') is used in consideration of the large number of much preparations as whey, coagulated milk and so forth; though curd alone is the direct preparation of milk. But if curd alone were meant to be included in the counter-exception, then the Author would have mentioned that alone by name. So that curd can never be regarded as 'kept over-night.' From this it follows that the prohibition contained in the present verse does not apply to whey, coagulated milk and such other preparations of milk.

'*He shall not commit gluttony*'—Eat too much. The stomach is divided into three parts: one part is to be filled with solid food, another with water and other liquids, and the third is to be left empty for the moving about of the juices; it is in this manner that one should eat; and this means that he shall not commit gluttony.

'*Very early*'—*i.e.*, just at sun-rise, one should not eat. For weaker people, the proper time for eating is after the expiry of three hours in the morning, and for other persons it is midday.

'*Not very late in the evening*'—*i.e.*, one shall not eat at sunset; '*nor in the evening, if the has eaten in the morning*,'—to his fill. This means that at both times one should eat while some hunger is still left. This is what

has been thus asserted—'Morning and evening are the two times for eating, ordained by the gods. But if one has eaten to his fill in the morning, then he shall not eat in the evening.'

Or, the text may be explained in the following manner :—'He shall not eat to his fill both in the morning and in the evening.' It is in view of this that Yājñavalkya (Achāra, 114) has advised light food in the evening.—(62)

VERSE LXIII.

HE SHALL NOT PUT FORTH ANY EXERTION WITHOUT A PURPOSE. HE SHALL NOT DRINK WATER WITH JOINED HANDS. HE SHALL NOT EAT ARTICLES OF FOOD IN HIS LAP. HE SHALL NEVER BE TOO CURIOUS.—(63)

Bhāṣya.

'*Exertion without a purpose*'—*i.e.*, that which does not bring any benefit, preceptible or imperceptible ; *e.g.*, hankering after news of other countries, and so forth.

'*Añjali*' is *joined palms* ;—with this '*he shall not drink water.*' Since water is mentioned by name, the prohibition does not apply to milk and other liquids.

'*Articles of food in his lap*'—fried grains and cakes, &c., he shall not eat, while they are on his thighs. The term '*articles of food*' extends the prohibition to fruits also. As for rice, the mixture of fried flour with water and such other semi-liquid things as cannot be eaten without mixing water,—there is no possibility of their being eaten on the lap.

'*Curiosity*'—is over-eagerness for information about things, without any purpose.

'*Na jātu*'—never.—(63).

VERSE LXIV.

HE SHALL NOT DANCE, NOR SING, NOR PLAY UPON MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS, NOR CLAP, NOR GRIND HIS TEETH, NOR, WHEN SATISFIED, SHALL HE CREATE ENMITY.—(64)

Bhāṣya.

'*Dancing*'—Throwing about of the limbs in a particular manner, as is well known among people.

'*Singing*'—is the producing of sound in the '*Sadja*' and other notes of music. What is forbidden here is ordinary *temporal*, not *Vedic*, singing ; the latter being actually enjoined.

'*Musical instruments*'—such as, the lute, the flute, the drum, and so forth. What is forbidden is the man himself playing upon these ; and not making other people play upon them ; as there is nothing to justify the construing of the verb '*vādayēt*' as containing a two-fold causal affix '*ṇich*'—which alone could afford the meaning of 'making to play.'

'*Clapping*'—the sound made by the clapping of the hands, or by striking the ground with the hand, and so forth.

'*Grinding of teeth*'—the indistinct sound made by the teeth is what is known by the name of '*Kṣvēḍanika*.'

If the man happens to be satisfied with another person, he shall not create enmity with him. The prohibition does not apply to the case where the man is harassed by the other person. The term '*virodhayēt*' is to be explained as '*virodham*' (this noun being found by the addition of the nominal affix '*ghaṉ*') '*kuryāt*' (this being the connotation of the '*ṇich*' affix).—(64)

VERSE LXV.

HE SHALL NEVER WASH HIS FEET IN A VESSEL OF WHITE BRASS. HE SHALL NOT EAT OUT OF A BROKEN DISH ; NOR OUT OF ONE THAT IS FELT TO BE DEFILED.—(65)

Bhāṣya.

He should not wash his feet in a vessel of white brass.

In a broken vessel—even in one that may be broken in a single place ;—the use of one that is broken all over would be forbidden by its very nature. In the case of cups, etc., made of leaves, however, since these are never regarded as 'broken vessels,' there would be no harm in using them, even though they may have holes.

'*Bhāva*' is feeling in mind; that vessel with which the mind does not feel satisfied; or that which is defiled by name—such as '*patadgraha*,' 'spittoon,' and the like. In the case of these latter also, the mind does not feel satisfied.—(65)

VERSE LXVI.

HE SHALL NOT USE SHOES, OR CLOTHES, OR SACRED THREAD, OR ORNAMENT, OR GARLAND, OR WATER-POT, WHICH HAS BEEN USED BY OTHERS.—(66)

Bhāṣya.

He should not wear these things, when they have been worn by his father and others. Gautama says—'In cases of disability, these may be used after having been washed.' (9·7)

'*Karaka*' is the water-pot; the using of the pot that is used by even his father is contrary to usage. The pot is held to be a relative substance, and hence can be used only by one to whom it belongs, and by no other person.

'*Ornament*'—bracelet of ivory, and so forth. By reason of this being mentioned along with such cheap articles as the 'water-pot,' and the like, it follows that the use of jewelry and pearl-ornaments is not forbidden. This is the view of some people.—(66)

VERSE XLVII.

HE SHALL NOT TRAVEL WITH UNTRAINED BEASTS OF BURDEN; NOR WITH SUCH AS ARE SUFFERING FROM HUNGER OR DISEASE; NOR WITH THOSE WHOSE HORNS, EYES OR HOOFS ARE INJURED; NOR WITH THOSE THAT ARE DISFIGURED BY THEIR TAILS.—(67)

Bhāṣya.

'*Untrained*'—*i.e.*, not trained; oxen, horses, mules and so forth, which are yoked to chariots, etc. The use of '*cha*' indicates that one shall not ride upon untrained beasts, even when they are not yoked to chariots, etc.

The 'injured horn' pertains to the *ox* only; as that alone has horns, and not horses and other animals.

'*Bāladhi*' is *tail*; those that have been disfigured by their tails; *i.e.*, whose tails have been cut off.

One should not travel on such animals. Another Smṛti text prohibits merely getting upon the back of such animals. —(67)

VERSE LXVIII.

HE SHOULD ALWAYS TRAVEL WITH BEASTS THAT ARE TRAINED, FAST, EQUIPPED WITH SIGNS, WELL ENDOWED WITH COLOUR AND FIGURE, —WITHOUT STRIKING THEM MUCH WITH THE GOAD.—(68)

Bhāṣya.

Some people, in their audacity, do not make any attempt at training animals. It is with a view to this that the Author adds this verse.

'*Trained*'—well-broken.

'*Fast*'—swift going.

'*Equipped with signs*'—with such signs as auspicious hair-whorls, and the like, and not with such unlucky marks as a bare forehead and the like.

'*Endowed with colour and form.*'—'*Colour*' stands for the brightness of the skin, etc., and '*form*' for the shape of the limbs. The 'goodness' of these has to be ascertained with the help of treatises dealing with the characterestics of animals, etc.

'*Without striking much*'—not causing them pain, again and again,—'*with the goad;*' as being struck again and again with the hook, etc., they become perturbed and cause injury. (68)

VERSE LXIX.

THE YOUNG SUN AND THE SMOKE FROM THE DEAD BODY, SHOULD BE AVOIDED, AS ALSO A BROKEN SEAT. HE SHALL NOT CUT HIS NAILS AND HAIR, NOR SHALL HE TEAR HIS NAILS WITH HIS TEETH.—69

Bhāṣya.

For three '*muhūrtas*' after rising, the sun is called the 'young sun.'

'*Smoke from the dead body*'—that which rises from a dead body being burnt.

'*Broken seat*'—*i.e.*, that which is torn, or with holes, or injured. All this should be avoided.

'*He shall not cut his nails and hair*'—himself ; when they have grown too long, he should get them cut by the barber.

He should not tear his nails—even though they may have become very long—with his teeth.

Others construe as follows :—'He shall not cut his nails and hair with his teeth,—and the nails he shall not cut even with his teeth.'

Young women often tear their nails, in the process of adorning them.—(69)

VERSE LXX.

HE SHALL NOT CRUSH CLODS OF EARTH ; NOR SHALL HE CUT GRASS WITH HIS NAILS. HE SHALL NOT DO AN AIMLESS ACT, NOR ONE THAT IS LIKELY TO LEAD TO DISAGREEABLE RESULTS.—(70)

Bhāṣya.

'*Crushing*' means *breaking into pieces*—of clods of earth ; some people hold that this refers also to such clods of earth as are mixed with lime or other mortar. The 'crushing' of the earth-clod consists either in raising it and then throwing it down, or by pressing it with the hands.

The crushing that is forbidden here is one that is done aimlessly ; nor when it is done for the purpose of being used in cleaning the hands, etc.,—the term 'aimless' of the next line being construed with this also. Though, as such, the crushing would be included under the 'aimless act,' yet it has been mentioned separately, with a view to the different expiatory rite that has been prescribed in connection with it.

'*Karaja*' are nails.

'*No aimless act.*'—*Objection*—"The *aimless act* has been already prohibited under 'purposeless exertion' (63)."

Some people offer the following explanation:—'*Exertion*' denotes *physical activity* ; while what is forbidden here is *activity in general* (in all its forms) ; which means that the building of airy castles is to be avoided.

'*Āyati*' denotes *future time*. That act from which there follows, in the future, some disagreeable result: *e.g.*, eating to indigestion, spending one's wealth without any consideration for the maintenance of one's family and dependants. All this he shall not do.—(70)

In support of the above, we have the following commendatory description—

VERSE LXXI.

A MAN WHO CRUSHES CLODS, CUTS GRASS OR BITES HIS NAILS, QUICKLY GOES TO PERDITION; SO ALSO THE BACK-BITER AND THE UNCLEAN MAN.—(71)

Bhāṣya.

It is in view of the word '*loṣṭha*,' 'clod,' being used here by itself that the compound '*mṛlloṣṭha*' of the preceding verse has been taken as a *Tatpuruṣa* compound; for, if both '*mṛt*' and '*loṣṭha*' were meant (and the compound were a *Dvandva* one) then, in the present verse also, '*mṛt*' would have been mentioned in the same manner as '*loṣṭha*.' Since clods are capable of being easily crushed, people are likely to do it; hence it becomes necessary to forbid it. As for lime-mortar, its crushing requires great effort, and hence people are not likely to do it needlessly. As for the crushing of earth-clods, on the other hand, some people are inclined, by their very nature, to do it; hence its prohibition.

'*Who cuts grass*'—as mentioned in the preceding verse.

'*He who bites his nails*'—with his teeth.

'*Sūchakaḥ*'—the informer, the back-biter; he who describes, behind his back, the defects, real or unreal, of another person.

'*Unclean*'—already explained.

'*Quickly goes to perdition.*'—Other Vedic acts are uncertain regarding the time at which their results appear; but the act here mentioned is not so; its result appears '*quickly*'—in this very life—in the shape of the loss of wealth, &c., which is what is meant here by '*perdition*.'

VERSE LXXII.

HE SHALL NOT CARRY ON A WRANGLING CONVERSATION. HE SHALL NOT WEAR A GARLAND OUTSIDE. RIDING ON THE BACK OF COWS AND OXEN IS ALTOGETHER DEPRECATED.—(72)

Bhāṣya.

When, either in ordinary conversation or in literary discussions, one talks with passion and lays a wager, and so forth, always trying to show himself off,—this is what is called '*wrangling conversation.*'

'*Garland outside ;'—i.e.*, if the garland happen to be above the clothing, it should be hidden with a piece of cloth. Such is the custom also.

Others have explained 'outside' to mean an open public place. The sense of the text in that case would be that one should not wander about in public places, as the road, &c., with a garland too obtrusively worn.

Or, '*bahirmālya*' may mean that whose fragrance has gone out ; *i.e.*, whose odour is not felt. Says another Smṛti text—'One should not wear an odourless garland, except that made of gold.'

'*Riding on the back of cows.*'—What is forbidden is riding on the bare back, without a saddle.—'*Altogether.*' When a saddle has been put on, or the animal has been harnessed to the cart, &c., then it would not be 'riding on the back ;' and hence these are not forbidden.—(72)

VERSE LXXIII.

HE SHALL NOT ENTER A WALLED VILLAGE OR HOUSE, EXCEPT THROUGH THE GATE. AT NIGHT, HE SHALL KEEP AWAY, AT A LONG DISTANCE, FROM THE ROOTS OF TREES.—(73)

Bhāṣya.

It is only in the case of the *walled* village that the text forbids entering, except through the gate, by passing over the walls and such other means. In the case of the unwalled village, one might do as one pleases, even though there be gates.—(73)

VERSE LXXIV.

HE SHALL NEVER GAMBLE WITH DICE; HE SHALL NOT HIMSELF CARRY HIS SHOES; HE SHALL NOT EAT, SEATED ON A BED; NOR WHAT HAS BEEN PLACED IN HIS HAND OR ON THE SEAT.—(74)

Bhāṣya.

Even without stakes, in mere joke also, '*he shall never gamble with dice.*' The term '*never*' is used for the purpose of precluding the use of sticks, and such other implements also. Hence all kinds of gambling are forbidden.

His shoes, made of leather, he shall not carry from one place to another, '*himself*'—*i.e.*, taking them in his own hand, or hanging them on his stick. This prohibition applies to one's own shoes, as is clear from the term 'himself;' hence the carrying of the shoes belonging to one's Teacher or other superiors is not forbidden.

'*On a bed*,'—seated on a couch, and such other things—'*he shall not eat;*' nor placing the food-morsel on his hand; nor placing the food on the seat, without an intervening dish. That this pertains to the food, and not to the eater, is clear from the juxtaposition of what has gone before.—(74)

VERSE LXXV.

ANY FOOD CONTAINING SESAMUM, HE SHALL NOT EAT AFTER SUNSET; HE SHALL NEVER SLEEP NAKED; NOR GO ANYWHERE WITH MOUTH UNWASHED AFTER MEALS.—(75)

Bhāṣya.

On the sun having set; the accusative ending in '*astam*' is in accordance with Pāṇini 1. 4. 90.

'*Nor go anywhere, etc.*'—"This has already been forbidden in the section dealing with the duties of the Student; where it has been also explained that the prohibition pertains to the men in general, and is not restricted to the Student only."

True; but the present injunction is for the purpose of pointing out the act as an 'observance;' and what is meant

is that 'One should make a life-long determination of not going about with mouth unwashed after meals.'—(75)

VERSE LXXVI

HE SHALL EAT WITH WET FEET ; BUT HE SHALL NOT SLEEP WITH HIS FEET WET. BY EATING WITH WET FEET, ONE WOULD ATTAIN LONG LIFE.—(76)

Bhāṣya.

Before the act of eating, one shall observe the rule that 'one should eat with wet feet ;' it is not meant that he should go on wetting his feet till he has finished eating and become fully satisfied.

'*Shall not sleep*'—*i.e.*, he shall not lay down his body upon the bed ; '*samvēshana*,' 'sleeping,' standing for the *laying down of the body on the bed.*

The reason for this is next mentioned—'*Long life.*'—It does not mean that the injunction is meant only for one who desires long life (and for none others) ; in fact, like the preceding ones, this also is obligatory ; and the mention of 'long life' is purely illustrative.—(76)

VERSE LXXVII.

HE SHALL NEVER APPROACH A PLACE DIFFICULT OF ACCESS, WHICH IS NOT WITHIN RANGE OF HIS VISION ; HE SHALL NOT LOOK AT URINE OR EXCRETA ; NOR SHALL HE CROSS A RIVER WITH HIS ARMS—(77)

Bhāṣya.

'*Difficult of access.*'—Mountains and such places as can be got at with difficulty ; as also a forest dense with trees, shrubs and creepers.

'*He shall not approach.*'—He shall not pass over, shall not go to.

'*Which is not within the range of his vision* ;'—because there is danger of snakes and robbers, etc., lying hidden there. The '*Eye*' includes also the other sources of knowledge, such as the Scriptures, for instance.

'*Urine and excreta*'—'Looking at—' these mean examining their colour, etc. This extends over a long time ; and hence

should not be done. There is no harm in seeing it once by the way.

Swimming a river is forbidden for a man in the normal state; and not when there is danger apprehended from wolves and other animals.—(77)

VERSE LXXVIII.

ONE WHO IS DESIROUS OF LIVING A LONG LIFE, SHALL NOT STEP ON HAIR, NOR ON ASHES, BONES AND POTSHERDS; OR ON COTTON-SEED OR CHAFF.—(78)

Bhāṣya

'*Potsherds*'—broken pieces of earthenware.

'*Long life.*'—This use of the Accusative has been already explained.—(78)

VERSE LXXIX.

HE SHALL NOT ASSOCIATE WITH OUTCASTS, NOR WITH CHĀṆḌĀLAS, NOR WITH PULKASAS; NOR WITH THE ILLITERATE; NOR WITH THE HAUGHTY; NOR WITH ANTYAS; NOR WITH ANTYĀVASĀYINS.—(79)

Bhāṣya.

"What is here said has already been declared above—(a) that 'he shall not live at a place surrounded by men......nor in that which is haunted by men of the lowest castes' (4. 6)."

Not so, we reply. What has been forbidden there, is the *inhabiting* of such places; while what is forbidden here is *associating*. What was said there was that 'one shall not set up as a householder in a village inhabited by such people;' while the present verse forbids associating with them; this 'associating' consisting of the setting up of friendly relations by accepting their gifts, living near their house, sitting with them under the shade of the same tree, and so forth. Further, the former text speaks of the village as being 'surrounded,' which implies that the said people live there in large numbers; so that, what it means is that 'one should not

live *even near* a village where the said people live in large numbers.' In the present verse, however, what is forbidden is living near a village, where even a few of these people live. Herein lies the difference between the two passages.

'*Pulkasas*' are Niṣādas, born of Shūdra mothers.

'*Antyas*,' *i.e.*—the *Mēdas* and other *Mlēchchhas*.

'*Antyāvasāyins*'—is born from a Niṣāda mother and Chāṇḍāla father; as will be described later on (10·39).

'*Haughty*'—overbearing in vanity due to wealth and such other causes.—(79)

VERSE LXXX.

HE SHALL NOT OFFER ADVICE TO A SHŪDRA, NOR THE LEAVINGS, NOR WHAT HAS BEEN PREPARED AS AN OFFERING TO THE GODS. HE SHALL NOT EXPOUND THE LAW TO HIM; NOR SHALL HE INDICATE TO HIM ANY PENANCE.—(80)

Bhāṣya.

No advice shall be offered to a Shūdra regarding his welfare or otherwise, regarding matters temporal or spiritual; that is to say, one should not become an adviser to a Shūdra.

This prohibition pertains to being an adviser as a means of livelihood; there would be nothing wrong in offering advice in a purely friendly manner; in fact, there may be hereditary friendship between Brāhmaṇas and Shūdras; and certainly through friendship advice for welfare is always offered. Further, it has been declared (by Manu himself) that the Brāhmaṇa should be *friendly* to all castes—'the Brāhmaṇa is one who is friendly to all.'

Some people offer the following explanation:—

"From what is said in other texts, it is better to take the present verse to mean that advice shall not be offered *unasked*; as declared above (in 2. 110),—'He should not say anything to any one without being asked.'"

This explanation, however, is not right. What has been said under 2.110, is in connection with the reading of the

Veda ; the sense being, 'if a man is found to be committing a mistake in accent, or syllable, or in some other detail, one should not tell him, unless one is asked, that he had murdered the Text.' Similarly, in connection with the enumeration of persons who shall not be taught the Veda, it has been said—' One shall not speak unasked ;' and this also means that, in the case of persons other than his own pupils, one should not say anything, even if he finds them reciting the Veda wrongly, either as regards accent or syllables.

'*Nor the leavings.*'—The term '*uchchhiṣṭa*' denotes *impurity, specially in relation to food.* One who has paid calls of nature, is also called '*uchchhiṣṭa,*' 'impure,' till he has washed ; as we shall explain under the text—'One who is *impure, uchchhiṣṭa,* shall not touch with his hand, &c.' (142). But, as a rule, the term is used in connection with *food.* So that, while one is eating, the food that comes into contact with his mouth, whether within the mouth or outside, becomes known as 'impure.' It is in this sense that under 5. 141—where it is said—' nor the hairs of the moustache entering the mouth,'—everything, with the exception of the hairs of the moustache, is said to become 'impure.' It is in this sense also that the eater, the thing eaten and the dish containing the food, all come to be called 'impure', '*uchchhiṣṭa.*'

In some cases, the word is also used in the sense of 'what has been left unused,' 'remnant,' 'leaving;' ; *e.g.*, in the passage—' The leavings of the substance offered are to be given as the fee.' Thus, it is on the basis of usage that the term '*uchchhiṣṭa*' is applied to the food that has been served in the dish for a particular person, and out of which a little has been eaten by him; and the clean food that is simply placed in the dish and not even touched by the eater,—this also is rejected, on the strength of usage, as 'impure,' on the ground of its being in contact with the dish which is in contact with that food out of which the person has eaten (and which therefore has become a 'leaving'). It is in accordance with

this that such passages as—(*a*) 'the leavings of food should be given' (10. 125), and (*b*) 'leavings shall not be given, etc.'—which contain an injunction and a prohibition, respectively—are taken as pertaining to the same thing, and as applying to the 'true' and the 'untrue' *Shūdra*, respectively, and also as referring to the remnants of different kinds of materials offered (and hence not being mutually contradictory). Or, the meaning (of the prohibition) may be that what has been left in the pot, after the guests and others have eaten, and which is as good as 'stale' and 'leavings,' should not be given to the *Shūdra*. It is argued that, since the term is found to be used (in 10.125) along with 'torn clothes,' this latter explanation is the right one to be accepted. Further, since the root '*shiṣ*' (from which '*uchchhiṣṭa*' has been derived) denotes 'other than what has been used,' and the preposition ('*ut*') has to be construed in accordance with that signification,—there need be nothing incongruous in construing this passage also in the same sense as the passage 'the leavings of the substance offered are to be given as the fee.' In this manner, there is no incompatibility between these two *Smṛti*-texts ('the leavings of the food shall be given' and 'the leavings should not be given'); though in most passages the term is restricted, by convention, to people who stand in need of washing. As for the declaration that 'the method of purification is like that of the Vaishya, etc.' (5.139)—this refers to the *Slave-Shūdra*; and the term '*uchchhiṣṭa*' in this passage is understood to mean 'the leavings of food,' as we shall show under this passage.

'*Nor what has been prepared as an offering to the Gods.*'—The term '*haviṣ-kṛtam*' means '*haviṣē kṛtam*,' 'prepared as an offering to the Gods.' The compound is an irregular one; the compounding of the participle '*kṛta*' or '*kalpita*,' with the noun ending in the Dative, having the sense of 'for the purpose of,' is not sanctioned.

According to the maxim of the 'stick and the cake'—by

which, when the stick on which cakes are hanging is brought down by rats, we are led to believe that the cakes have been eaten by them,—the prohibition contained in the text pertains to every such thing as has the slightest possibility of being intended for being offered. And thus it is that the prohibition becomes applicable (*a*) to what has been set aside as being meant for an offering, (*b*) to the remnant of the substance that has been offered, and (*c*) to such offering-material as has not been left after having been eaten. It is in view of this that the text has used the term '*kṛta*,' which is the most general term denoting *action of any kind*; and the compound '*haviṣ-kṛta*' means 'what has been *kṛta*,' *i.e.*, determined upon—as to be offered.' And in this way, the offering-material that is left after the sacrificer has eaten it, does not cease to be included under the term '*haviṣ-kṛta*,' since that also is what 'had been determined upon as to be offered.' And thus the prohibition becomes applicable to the substance in all conditions (after it has been once fixed upon as to be offered).

By others the term '*haviṣ-kṛtam*' has been explained as 'mixed with the offering-material;' and since what is mixed up with something else is prohibited, the unmixed offering-material also becomes forbidden. For instance, when it is intended to forbid what is related to the Brāhmaṇa, the texts use the word 'Brāhmaṇa' only.

"But how can the prohibition of the thing mixed with something else imply the prohibition of that thing by itself?"

If the thing by itself were prohibited, then it might have been argued that the prohibition of the mixed thing is secondary. In a case, however, where, even on being mixed up, the two things are percieved as distinct,—or, when, even though the colour of the two things is not visible, yet by means of taste and such other means they are percieved as distinct,—the two things are treated as if they were there by themselves.

For instance, when fried flour and other things are mixed with wine, even though the colour of the wine is not visible, yet, since the taste of the wine is distinctly felt, the eating of such flour entails the expiratory rite prescribed in connection with the drinking of wine.

Objection—"But even so, when the wine is mixed up with the flour, it loses its liquid form ; so that it cannot be a case of *drinking* of the wine."

There is no force in this objection. 'Drinking' has been mentioned, because that is how wine is generally taken ; and what is forbidden is the '*taking*' of wine ; as the present context is dealing with what shall be eaten and what shall be not eaten ; and 'eating' here means only '*taking*,' of which *drinking*, *eating*, *chewing* and the rest are only special forms. As for *smelling*, since it is felt even when the substance is not near at hand, it does not necessarily lead to the presence of the substance itself. For instance, even when camphor and such things are at a distance, their odour is felt. If it be assumed that the odour is felt because of the fine particles of the substance (having been wafted into the nostrils),—then such wafting away of the particles should bring out a gradual diminution of the size of the substance (which is not found to take place). In a case where two things become mixed up and form one composite substance, and there is nothing to indicate a reference to either one of them singly,—either a sanction or a prohibition cannot apply to either of them by itself. *E.g.*, when it is said 'milk should be drunk,' it applies to the milk and the water both mixed together, and not to the *water* alone, or the *milk* alone ; as each of these would be a distinct substance (from 'milk'); each of these by itself would have a distinct colour and a distinct taste indicating its presence ; and hence each would be a distinct substance.

—"If this be so, then, when one drinks wine mixed with water, it should not entail the expiatory rite that has been

prescribed for the *drinking of wine*; as the mixture would be a distinct substance from the mixture drunk."

There is no force in this objection. Wine, like the bitter taste, entirely suppresses the taste of everything else; so that, since in the case cited, the taste of wine will have been clearly felt, the said expiatory rite becomes necessary. When there is much water and only a little wine, the expiatory rite to be performed is that which has been prescribed for 'contact with wine,' as we shall explain in detail under Discourse 11.

From all this it follows that where the prohibition is of a certain thing by itself, it might involve that of its mixture also; *e.g.*, when it is said that "*māṣa*-grains shall not be eaten,' such grains also become eschewed as have *māṣa* mixed with them. But the prohibition that pertains to a mixture —on what grounds could it be applied to the unmixed thing by itself? *E.g.*, when it is said—'bring water from the confluence of the Gangā and the Yamunā,'—the man thus directed does not bring water either from the Gangā alone, or from the Yamunā alone. If usage be cited as the ground for such application,—then such usage has got to be shown. [Thus, if the term '*haviṣkṛtan*' of the text were taken as '*havirmishram*,' then the prohibition could not apply to the *Haviṣ* itself.]

'*He shall not expound the law to him.*'—

"The very first words of this text have forbidden the offering to a *Shūdra* of any advice on temporal or spiritual matters; and the expounding of law also becomes forbidden by the same words."

True; but the prohibition has been repeated for the purpose of additional information; in the shape of special expiatory rites—laid down in connection with the expounding of the law to a Shūdra,—which we shall explain under 11. 198.

Others have taken this additional prohibition to mean that 'he shall not, in the craracter of an officiating priest, instruct the *Shūdra* regarding the details of procedure pertaining to the *Pārvaṇa Shrāddha*, the *Pākayajña* and such other rites.

Some people urge the following objection here:—" If the expounding of law to the *Shūdra* is forbidden, from whence is the *Shūdra* to acquire his knowledge of the law? In the absence of such knowledge, he can perform no rites; so that the whole scripture dealing with the rites to be performed by the *Shūdra* would be pointless."

This is not a right objection. It is just possible that the Brāhmaṇa, through avarice, may transgress the prohibition and teach the *Shūdra*. For instance, when the Brāhmaṇa accepts a gift from a *Shūdra*, he is urged to it, not by the Injunction relating to the 'giving away of all one's belongings' (which has been prescribed for the *Shūdra*) in consequence of having killed a Brāhmaṇa; in fact, the motive is supplied by his avarice.

" Well, we have the direct declaration that 'the Brāhmaṇa shall explain the law to others also.'"

But that refers only to the possible means of livelihood (open to the *Shūdra*). What the text says is—'The Brāhmaṇa should know the means of livelihood open to all, and should explain it to others also' (10.2).

Advice and teachings have to be certainly given to the *Shūdra* who is dependent upon oneself; for an ignorant person is sure to transgress injunctions and prohibitions; and association with such transgressers has been forbidden under 79 above.

Some people explain the text as follows:—

" The present text contains two injunctions forbidding the teaching of the text of the treatises dealing with Dharma or Law, and the expounding of its meaning: one

forbids the teaching of the verbal text and the other that of its meaning. But the expounding of Law, without reference to text, is not forbidden by any."

But for those who explain the text thus, the present verse will be a mere repetition of the prohibition of consultation on matters relating to the scriptures.

The following might be urged here—"The term 'law' applies to Grammar and all those treatises that help in obtaining the knowledge of Law; but Grammar is not a 'scriptural treatise,' in the sense of expounding super-senseous (spiritual) things; hence the teaching of Grammar would not be included under the prohibition here put forward; and yet Grammar is of use in the understanding of Law; specially as the grammarian can, by a close analysis of the words, find out the meaning of the most difficult sentence. So that, since the prohibition relating to the 'consultation' (quoted above) pertains to the 'Law-scriptures' proper, it would not apply to Grammar; hence it is the teaching of Grammar that has been separately forbidden by the present text."

All this would be quite right; only if no one urged that one who is not entitled to the primary thing (the Veda), can never be thought of as taking up its subsidiaries (the subsidiary sciences of Grammar, &c.) In the present instance, the Veda and this Smṛti texts constitute the 'primary;' and to the study of these the *Shūdra* is not entitled.

'*Nor shall he indicate to him any vrata or penance.*'—The term '*vrata,*' 'penance,' here stands for the *kṛchchhras*; such being the sense in which the term has been used in 11.102 and other texts. These he shall not indicate to the *Shūdra* who is seeking to acquire prosperity by their means; in connection with expiatory rites, they have got to be indicated. As for the '*vratas,*' 'observances,' prescribed for the 'accomplished student,' there is no possibility of these pertaining to the *Shūdra*; for the simple reason that he can never be an

'accomplished student.' Similarly, the imparting of the *Sāvitrī* to him is impossible, because he can never carry on Vedic Study; Vedic Study is not possible for him, because he has not been *initiated*; and Initiation is not possible for him, because it has been laid down for the *three castes* only.—(80).

VERSE LXXXI.

HE WHO EXPOUNDS TO HIM THE LAW, AND HE WHO INDICATES THE PENANCE TO HIM, WILL SINK, ALONG WITH HIM, INTO THE HELL CALLED "ASAMVṚTA."—(81).

Bhāṣya.

This is a deprecatory supplement to the foregoing text.

'*Will sink along with him*;'—this shows that both parties are considered guilty—he who expounds, as also he who hears it expounded.

'*Will sink*'—will fall into, *i.e.*, will reach.—(81).

VERSE LXXXII.

HE SHALL NOT SCRATCH HIS OWN HEAD WITH BOTH HANDS JOINED TOGETHER; HE SHALL NOT TOUCH IT WHILE UNCLEAN; AND HE SHALL NOT BATHE WITHOUT IT.—(82).

Bhāṣya.

'*Joined together*'—joined to one another. This forbids the scratching of the head with both hands at the same time.

'*Hands*;'—this forbids the use of the two arms joined together.

'*His own*'—not that of others; hence there would be nothing wrong in having one's head scratched with the two hands of another person.

Since the *head* has been specified, there would be nothing wrong in scratching the back and other parts of the body.

'He shall not touch it'—his own head, with his own hand,—or with any other part of the body, as some people have explained. But this is not right, as it is the *hands* that are being spoken of in the text.

'He shall not bathe without it'—*i.e.*, without the head. This rule applies to all kinds of bathing—the daily obligatory one as well as the occasional one.

"Why should this rule be observed in the case of ordinary bathing, done by a person who has perspired (and only wishes to clean the perspiration)?"

That it should be so follows from the fact that the present rule is meant to be taken along with the rule laying down *bathing*.

For connecting this rule with the *bathing* that is directly enjoined,—there may be some reason. But, so far as the *ordinary* bathing is concerned, since there is no injuction regarding it, there can be no ground for observing the present rule in connection with it."

Well, as a matter of fact, the root 'to bathe' denotes the act of washing with water, cow's urine and such things—*the whole body* or the rest of the body, *barring the head.* And, since people might leave off the head, when bathing on having touched a *Chāṇḍāla,* or some such unclean thing,—the text forbids this by the rule—'he shall not bathe without the head.' Ordinary bathing, without washing the head, is of course possible; in view of which we have such assertions as—'having *bathed his head,* etc., etc.,'—(82)

VERSE LXXXIII.

CATCHING OF THE HAIR, AS ALSO STRIKING ON THE HEAD,—THESE HE SHALL AVOID; HAVING HIS HEAD BATHED, HE SHALL TOUCH NO LIMB WITH OIL.—(83)

Bhāṣya.

Some people hold that this refers to one's own head, as well as to the head of other persons; while others connect this with the term, 'his own,' of the preceding verse.

What is forbidden here is the hair-catching, etc., done in anger; for there is 'hair-catching' also during sexual intercourse, and this is not forbidden.

The compound '*shiraḥ-snāta*' is to be expounded as '*shiraḥ snātam anēna*,' he whose head has been bathed, the order of the term being in accordance with the rule governing such compounds as, by appearance, belong to the '*Rājadanta*' group (Pāṇini 2-2-31).

'*He shall not touch any limb*'—of his own.—(83)

SECTION IX—GIFTS NOT TO BE ACCEPTED.

VERSE LXXXIV.

HE SHALL NOT ACCEPT GIFTS FROM A KING NOT BORN OF THE KṢATTRIYA CASTE; NOR FROM THE KEEPERS OF SLAUGHTER-HOUSES, OIL-PRESSES OR GROG-SHOPS; NOR FROM THOSE WHO LIVE ON BROTHELS.—(84)

Bhāṣya.

It has been said alove (4.33) that 'he shall seek for wealth form Kings.' This word, "king," denoting the *lord of men*, has been found to be applied to the *Kṣattriya* as well as the *non-Kṣattriya*; *e.g.*, in such expressions as 'the Kingdom of Brāhmaṇas.' Hence, in connection with a rule regarding the acceptance of gifts, when we find a prohibition, we take the term as standing for the *lord of men*; specially, as in the present verse, we have the phrase '*not born of the Kṣattriya caste.*' Since it is possible for one to accept, through avarice, the gifts of the lords of men, belonging to all castes, the text has specified it; the sense being—'one shall not accept gifts from such a lord of men as is not born of the *Kṣattriya* caste; nor even from the *Kṣattriya* king, who does not behave according to the scriptures;' as will be made clear by the prohibition coming later on.

'*Sūnā*' is *slaughter-house*; and he who lives by selling meat, after having slaughtered the animal, is called a butcher,' a 'keeper of the slaughter-house.'

Similarly, '*chakravān*' is one who lives by oil-pressing; who is known among men as '*khaṭika*.'

'*Dhvaja*' is wine-shop; and the '*dhvajavān*' is he who lives by buying and selling wine.

'*Vēsha*' is brothel; he who lives by this—be it a man or a woman.—(84)

VERSE LXXXV.

ONE OIL-PRESS IS EQUAL TO TEN SLAUGHTER-HOUSES; ONE GROG-SHOP IS EQUAL TO TEN OIL-PRESSES; ONE BROTHEL IS EQUAL TO TEN GROG-SHOPS; AND ONE KING IS EQUAL TO TEN BROTHELS.—(85)

Bhāṣya.

This is meant to show that the receiving of gifts from the one mentioned later is more reprehensible than that from the one mentioned before it.

As for the means of subsistence during abnormal times, this shall be described later on.—(85)

VERSE LXXXVI.

A KING HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE EQUAL TO A BUTCHER WHO MAINTAINS TEN THOUSAND SLAUGHTER-HOUSES; AND TERRIBLE IS THE RECEIVING OF GIFTS FROM HIM.—(86)

Bhāṣya.

'*Saunika*' is one who maintains a slaughter-house.

'*Maintains*'—carries on for his own benefit.

'*Terrible*;'—it is frightful, as leading to hell, and other places.—(86)

VERSE LXXXVII.

HE WHO ACCEPTS GIFTS FROM A KING WHO IS AVARICIOUS AND BEHAVES CONTRARY TO THE SCRIPTURES, GOES, IN SUCCESSION, TO THESE TWENTY-ONE HELLS:—(87)

Bhāṣya.

This is an exaggerated deprecation of receiving gifts from Kings.

'*Avaricious*'—who is in the habit of extracting riches from his subsidiary chiefs.

'*Who behaves contrary to the scriptures*'—he who acts against the laws laid down under 11-22 *et. seq.*, and inflicts undue punishments, confiscates the women, and so forth.

'*In succession*'—*i.e.*, he goes to another hell after having experienced the sufferings of one.

'*Hell.*'—This term signifies *extreme suffering*; and, since *extreme suffering* is all that is meant to be expressed, the singular number would be the proper form; and the number '*twenty-one*' is an exaggerated description.—(87)

VERSE LXXXVIII-LXXXX.

(1) TĀMIṢRA, (2) ANDHATĀMISRA, (3) MAHĀRAURAVA, (4) RAURAVA, (5) KĀLASŪTRA-NARAKA, (6) MAHĀNARAKA, (7) SAÑJĪVANA, (8) MAHĀVĪCHI, (9) TĀPANA, (10) SAMPATĀPANA, (11) SAMHĀTA, (12) SAKĀKOLA, (13) KUḌMALA, (14) PŪTIMṚTTIKA, (15) LOHASHAṄKU, (16) ṚJĪṢA, (17) PATHIN, (18) SHĀLMALĪ, (19) NADĪ, (20) ASIPATRAVANA AND (21) LOHADĀRAKA.—(88-90).

Bhāṣya.

The meaning of these three verses is clear.—(88-90)

VERSE LXXXXI.

KNOWING THIS, THE LEARNED BRĀHMAṆAS READING THE VEDAS DO NOT ACCEPT GIFTS FROM A KING, IF THEY DESIRE TO SECURE WELFARE AFTER DEATH.—(91)

Bhāṣya.

This is the final summing up of the foregoing rules forbidding the acceptance of gifts.

Knowing that the accepting of gifts from kings is the source of various forms of suffering, learned Brāhmaṇas should not accept gifts from kings.

'*After death*'—*i.e.*, in the next birth;—'*welfare*'—good;—those who desire. The term '*prētya*,' which has the form of a participle, is a totally different word.

'*Brahma*' is Veda; those who '*read*,' study it.

The epithets, '*learned*' and '*reading the Vedas*,' have been added with a view to indicate the excessive character of the suffering. Such persons suffer the greatest pains, resulting from the said acceptance of gifts; as it is going to be declared—'the learned man should fight shy of that.'—(91).

SECTION X—DAILY DUTIES.

VERSE LXXXXII.

HE SHALL WAKE UP AT THE POINT OF TIME SACRED TO BRAHMAN, AND THEN THINK OVER THE MEANS OF ACQUIRING MERIT AND WEALTH, OF THE BODILY TROUBLES INVOLVED THEREIN, AND ALSO OF THE TRUE MEANING OF THE VEDA.—(92).

Bhāṣya.

The night being divided into three parts, the last part is the '*point of time sacred to Brahman*;' and it is at this time that one should renounce sleep.

Fully awakened at the said time, he shall '*think over the means of acquiring Merit* (*i.e., Duty*) *and Wealth*'; he should also think over the bodily trouble involved in the performance of his duties (as bringing merit); and if he finds that a certain duty is an unimportant one, and yet its fulfilment involves much bodily trouble,—or, if he finds that it stands in the way of another Duty,—then he shall omit such a duty. Similarly, the means of acquiring *Wealth* also—such as service and the like—are the source of much trouble; and this also shall be omitted; in view of the principle that 'one should protect oneself from all things.'

What is meant is that he should not do anything without having duly thought over it, and that he should not indulge in building castles in the air. It is the very nature of men that, when they are not outwardly engaged, there arise in their minds many fancies, in the form of a longing for obtaining what belongs to others, and so forth. And it is the avoiding of this that the text lays down, with a view to the man's temporal interests.

At the said time, '*the true meaning of the Veda*' should also be thought over, in its bearing upon causes and effects. That is, one should meditate, in the manner laid down in the Vedānta, upon the esoteric science of the Soul. Or, in connection with the ritualistic section of the Veda also, he should ponder over the real meaning of the texts; that is, in his own mind he should determine that 'this is an Injunction,' 'this its meaning;' 'this the action prescribed,' 'this is the form of the act,' 'this is the Deity of this sacrifice,' 'this the material to be employed,' 'such and such a person is entitled to its performance,' 'such and such is the procedure to be adopted,' and so forth. He should also ponder over the diverse explanations provided by the Commentators, and with the help of reason, he should decide whose explanation is correct and whose wrong.—(92).

VERSE LXXXXIII.

HAVING RISEN, AND HAVING ACCOMPLISEHD THE NECESSITIES OF NATURE, HE SHALL PERFORM THE PURIFICATIONS, AND, WITH COLLECTED MIND, HE SHALL STAND, REPEATING FOR A LONG TIME (THE SĀVITRĪ), DURING THE MORNING-TWILIGHT, AS ALSO DURING THE EVENING-TWILIGHT, AT ITS PROPER TIME.'—(93).

Bhāṣya.

When the night has passed and the dawn appeared, he should leave his bed.

'*Necessities of nature.*'—Evacuating of the bladder and of the bowels. As a rule, people do this act at that time; hence the evacuating has been called a 'necessity.'

'*Purifications*;'—*i.e.*, brushing of the teeth, &c.; having done all this; this is what is meant by 'performing the purifications;'—*i.e.*, having washed and cleansed himself, according to the rules laid down in 5.136.

'*With a collected mind*;'—*i.e.*, withdrawing his mind from all other thoughts.

'*He shall stand during the morning twilight,—repeating*—*the Sāvitrī* ;—he shall fix his mind upon the god Sun—'*for a long time.*'

The time of 'twilight' has been described as extending up to the appearance of the Sun ; and even longer than this, one shall go on repeating the *Sāvitrī*, if he desire longevity. It is for the adding of this prolongation that the afore mentioned Injunction regarding the Twilight Prayers (See 2.101) has been reitarated. '*Also during the evening twilight,—at its proper time*;'—*i.e.*, beginning from sunset and prolonging it till after the appearance of the stars—(93)

VERSE LXXXXIV.

IT WAS BY REASON OF THEIR PROLONGED TWILIGHT-DEVOTIONS THAT THE SAGES OBTAINED LONG LIFE, WISDOM, FAME, REPUTATION AND BRAHMIC GLORY.—(94)

Bhāṣya.

The Author proceeds to show for what purpose the aforesaid act has been prescribed. The meaning is that if one desires such rewards as long life and so forth, he should perform the twilight-devotions for a long time. Though the act is an obligatory one, yet the said rewards follow from prolonging it.

This prolongation is possible only for one who is either without Fires, or is away from home. As for others (*e.g.*, the man with the Fires living at home), the prolongation of the Twilight-Devotions would inpinge upon the time laid down for the Agnihotra-offerings.

The twilight devotion is called '*prolonged*,' only figuratively ; the term 'twilight devotion' standing for the reciting of Mantras, etc., that is done in connection with the said devotion.

The compound '*dīrghasandhyā*' is a *Bahuvrīhi.*

The mention of the sages is by way of a commendatory statement—(94)

SECTION (11)—VEDIC STUDY.

VERSE LXXXXV.

HAVING PERFOMED THE "UPĀKARMA" (STARTING RITE) ON THE FULL-MOON DAY IN THE MONTH OF SHRĀVAṆA OR OF BHĀDRAPADA, THE BRĀHMAṆA SHALL, WITH DUE DILIGENCE, STUDY THE VEDAS, ACCORDING TO RULE, DURING FOUR MONTHS AND A HALF.—(95)

Bhāṣya.

The full moon day related to the asterism of *Shravaṇā* is called '*Shrāvaṇī*;' similarly, '*Prauṣṭhapadī.*'—On either of these days,—'*having performed the rite known as "Upākarma,"*'—he shall study the Vedas,—'*according to rule*;' this refers to the rules laid down under 2.75 *et seq.*—*Yukta*—applying himself with diligence.

'*Chhandāmsi*'—the Vedas. The term '*chhandas*' here stands for the Veda, and not for the metres, *Gāyatrī* and the rest. Hence this same rule applies also to the case of those who are studying the *prose-Brāhmaṇas* (and is not restricted to those studying the metrical *samhitā* texts only). It is only right that the rule should be so applicable, as both (prose and metrical portions) are equally regarded as 'Veda.'

In this connection, the option referred to has been restricted to the extent that the students of the Sāma-Veda perform the 'Upākarma' on the full-moon day of *Bhādrapada*, while those of the Ṛgveda and the Yajurveda do it on that of *Shrāvaṇa*—(95)

VERSE LXXXXVI.

THE BRĀHMAṆA SHALL PERFORM, OUTSIDE, THE "UTSARJANA" (SUSPENSION) OF THE VEDAS ON THE DAY OF THE PUṢYA ASTERISM, OR ON THE FORENOON OF THE FIRST DAY OF THE BRIGHT FORTNIGHT OF THE MONTH OF MĀGHA.—(96)

Bāaṣya.

On the expiry of the four months and a half, when the *Puṣya* asterism comes for the first time,—on that day, one should perform the 'Utsarjana' rite. The exact form of this rite has been described by the authors of the *Gṛhyasūtras.*

'*Outside*'—*i.e.*, in an uncovered place.

The exact form of these two rites—the '*Upākarma*'—and the '*Utsarjana*' should be learnt from the *Gṛhyasūtras*—(96)

VERSE LXXXXVII.

HAVING PERFORMED, ACCORDING TO LAW, THE "UTSARGA" OF THE VEDAS, HE SHALL CEASE FOR THE NIGHT WITH ITS TWO WINGS, INCLUDING THE SAME DAY AND NIGHT.—(97)

Bhāṣya

Having perfomed the 'Utsarga'-rite, he shall not read the Veda for two days and one night ; *i.e.*, during '*that same day and night*,' and during the next *day* only (not the *night*). During this time, '*he shall cease*'—*i.e.*, not read the Veda.

The night, along with the preceding and the following days, is called '*the night with its two wings.*'

Or, the day on which the 'Utsarga' rite has been performed, that day and the same night are 'holidays ;' and on the next day the study should be resumed.

According to the former explanation, the next day is an 'holiday,' and study is to be resumed on the second night.'—(97)

VERSE LXXXXVIII.

AFTER THIS, HE SHALL DILIGENTLY READ THE VEDAS DURING THE BRIGHT FORTNIGHTS, AND ALL THE SUBSIDIARY SCIENCES DURING THE DARK FORTNIGHTS.—(98)

Bhāṣya

'*After this*'—after the 'Utsarga' rite has been performed,—subsequently, '*during the brighter fortnights*,' he shall read the Vedas, which consist of the collection of *Mantras* and

Brāhmaṇas. The '*subsidiary sciences,*' *i.e.*, the Phonetics, Rituals, Grammar and the rest,—he shall read '*during the dark fortnights.*'—(98)

ERSE LXXXXIX.

HE SHALL RECITE, NOT INDISTINCTLY, NOR IN THE PROXIMITY OF SHŪDRAS ; NOR SHALL BE GO TO SLEEP AGAIN, AT THE END OF NIGHT, WHEN HE IS TIRED AFTER HAVING RECITED THE VEDA.—(99)

Bhāṣya

'*Indistinct*'—when the letters and accents are not clearly pronounced. This happens when a man is reciting hurriedly.

'*At the end of night*'—in the latter part of night. If he, on rising from sleep, study the Veda, he shall not, if he becomes tired, go to sleep again. The right reading is—'*na nishāntē parishrānto brahmādhītya shayīta tu.*'—(99)

VERSE C.

ACCORDING TO THE PRESCRIBED RULE, THE BRĀHMAṆA SHALL, EVERY DAY, DURING NORMAL TIMES, DILIGENTLY RECITE THE VEDA IN VERSE, AS ALSO THE VEDA IN VERSE AND PROSE.—(100)

Bhāṣya

The term '*verse*' stands for the '*Gāyatrī*' and other metres ; and the Veda *with* these, is the *Ṛgveda,* and also the *Sāma Veda.* The term '*kṛta*' is used here in the sense of *association*, the root '*kṛ*' having several significations, it is explained as denoting 'association' in the present context. The root '*kṛ*' has the sense of '*collecting*' in such expressions as '*gomayān kuru*' (collect cowdung),—it has the sense of *rubbing*, in the expression '*pṛṣṭham kuru*' (Rub the back) ; similarly, in the present text it means 'association.'

'*Brahmachhandaskṛtam*'—that which is in verse and prose. In the Yajurveda, there are prose-passages, as also Mantras composed in the *Gāyatrī* and other metres ; both kinds of passages being found in the same chapter. It is not

so in the Ṛgveda or in the Sāma Veda; in both of which the *mantras* (in metre) form one part and the *Brāhmaṇas* (prose) form a distinct part. It is on the basis of this difference in the character of the Vedas that the text mentions them in the way in which it has done. Thus have the older writers explained the text.

'*According to rule.*'—This sums up the rules laid down in connection with normal times. In abnormal times, one would need the presence of the Teacher for enlightening him regarding the distinction mentioned in the text; and if, on that account, he were not to repeat the texts, he would forget them; hence, in this case, the aforesaid distinction need not be observed.—(100)

SECTION (12)—DAYS UNFIT FOR STUDY.

VERSE CI.

ONE WHO IS STUDYING THE VEDA SHOULD ALWAYS AVOID THESE DAYS, AS UNFIT FOR STUDY; SO ALSO THE PERSON WHO IS DOING THE TEACHING OF PUPILS ACCORDING TO RULE.—(101)

Bhāṣya.

'*These*'—*i.e.*, those going to be described;—'he shall avoid who is reading the Veda, as also the person who does the teaching.' Inasmuch as the work of *teaching* is mentioned, the reading of the Veda for the purpose of repeating and getting up (the old lessons) is permitted (on the days specified).

'*Always*;'—*i.e.*, not only after the performance of the '*Utsarga*'-rite, but also during the four months and a half, following the '*Upākarma*' rite.

'*Of pupils*'—this is only an explanatory reiteration.—(101)

VERSE CII.

(*a*) AT NIGHT, WHEN AIR IS AUDIBLE BY THE EAR, AND (*b*) IN THE DAY WHEN THERE IS DUST-WHORL,—THESE TWO OCCASIONS DURING THE RAINS ARE DECLARED BY THOSE VERSED IN THE RULES OF TEACHING TO BE UNFIT FOR STUDY.—(102)

Bhāṣya.

When the wind blows with force, a sound is heard, which is produced by the impact of another (contrary) wind; this is what is called the '*air audible by the ear*.' That which is heard by the ears is called '*audible by the ear*;' the compound being between the instrument (ear) and the noun formed by a verbal affix. The term 'ear' is added for the purpose of indicating a particular condition, because hearing

is always by means of ears. The meaning is that 'when the sound of wind is heard, study should not be carried on.'

'*Dust-whorl*'—that which brings together dust; '*pāmsu*' meaning *dust*; this is mentioned only as indicative of the wind that produces it (*i. e.*, the dust-storm). The meaning is that 'after it has rained, whenever such a wind blows, that time shall be regarded as unfit for study.'

'*Versed in the rules of teaching*,'—who are conversant with the rules regulating the practice of teaching.—(102)

VERSE CIII.

WHEN THERE IS LIGHTNING, THUNDER AND RAIN,—WHEN THERE IS PROMISCUOUS FALLING OF METEORS;—ON THESE OCCASIONS, THERE SHALL BE NO STUDY TILL THE SAME TIME (NEXT DAY):—THUS HAS MANU DECLARED.—(103)

Bhāṣya.

'*Vidyut*'—lightning;—'*stanita*'—thunder. The copulative compound indicates that it is 'time unfit for study' only when all these appear simultaneously.

'*Meteor*'—is the name given to the light emanating from the stars that fall from the sky;—'*the promiscuous falling*' of these is their falling here and there.

The term '*ākālikam*' stands for the time beginning from the occurrences mentioned and ending with the same time on the following day.

The name of Manu has been mentioned for the purpose of filling up the verse. Others have explained this to mean that an option is meant.—(103)

VERSE CIV.

WHEN THESE APPEAR AFTER THE FIRES HAVE BEEN LIGHTED, THEN IS IT TO BE REGARDED AS TIME UNFIT FOR STUDY; AS ALSO WHEN CLOUDS ARE SEEN OUT OF SEASON.—(104)

Bhāṣya.

It does not make the time unfit for study, if the said things appear at any time; it is only when they appear, *after*

the Fires have been lighted,' '*prāduṣkṛtāgniṣu* ;'—*i.e.*, at the time of twilight ; as it is only at these times that the Fires are always set ablaze for the purpose of pouring the libations. The term '*prāduṣ*' signifies *visibility*.

'*Out of season.*'—The 'season' is the Rainy season ; other than this is the time beginning with the autumn. During that time, if clouds *are seen*. This also is meant to be taken along with the phrase, '*after the Fires have been lighted.*'—104).

VERSE CV.

WHEN THERE IS PRETER-NATURAL SOUND, WHEN THERE IS EARTHQUAKE, AND WHEN THERE IS AN IMPACT OF PLANETS,—THESE ARE TO BE REGARDED AS TIME UNFIT FOR STUDY, UNTIL THE SAME HOUR NEXT DAY,—EVEN DURING THE SEASON.—(105).

Bhāṣya.

'*Preternatural sound*'—an ominous sound emanating from the sky.

'*Of planets*'—Moon, Sun, Jupiter, and the rest. '*Impact*'—*i.e.*, a halo round them, or mutual contact.

'*Even during the season.*'—'Even' has been added with a view to the fact that portents are not regarded as such, during the rains.—(105).

VERSE CVI.

WHEN LIGHTNING AND THE ROAR OF THUNDER APPEAR AFTER THE FIRES HAVE BEEN LIGHTED, THE TIME SHALL CONTINUE TO BE UNFIT FOR STUDY, TILL THE LIGHTS ARE THERE ; AND WHEN THE REMAINING (PHENOMENON) OCCURS, IT IS UNFIT FOR STUDY DURING THE NIGHT, AS ALSO DURING THE DAY.—(106).

Bhāṣya.

The previous verse (103) has declared that when the three phenomena—lightning, thunder and rain—appear together, it is to be regarded as 'time unfit for study,' till the same hour next day. The present verse declares that when only two of these appear together, it is unfit for study till the lights are seen.

The compound '*stanitaniḥsvanaḥ*' means the *roaring of thunder*; and this, with the term '*vidyut*,' forms the copulative compound '*vidyut-stanitaniḥsvanaḥ*.' When these two appear at twilight, it is to be regarded as time unfit for study '*till the lights are there*.' During the day, the sun is the '*light*,' and during the night fire is the '*light*.' So that, if the phenomena appear at morning twilight, it is unfit for study only during the day, not at night; similarly if they appear at evening twilight, it is unfit for study during the night; and there is nothing wrong in reading in the morning.

From among the three phenomena (mentioned in 103) —'lightning, thunder and rain'—two have been mentioned here separately. So that 'rain' is the '*remaining*' phenomenon; and when this third phenomenon appears, it is unfit for study till the same time next day. It is in view of this that it is said '*during the night as also during the day*.'

Another reading is '*shēṣam*,' which means the *remaining portion*, of the well-known sacrifices of *Jyotiṣṭoma* and the rest; the sense being that 'the day on which these sacrifices are performed, the whole of that day is unfit for study.'

"Wherefore did not the Author say simply—'*shēṣam tvākālikam smṛtam*' (which would be much simpler)?"

Manu's methods of composing his texts are most peculiar.—(106).

VERSE CVII.

IN VILLAGES AND CITIES, IT IS ALWAYS UNFIT FOR STUDY, FOR THOSE WHO SEEK FOR PERFECT MERIT; AS ALSO IN FOUL-SMELLING PLACES.—(107).

Bhāṣya.

Those who desire perfect merit, should not study in villages and cities.—The term, '*dharma*,' '*merit*,' stands for the *result* of merit, in the shape of Heaven, &c. Or, the 'perfection of merit' may consist in freedom from all contact with demerit; whereby the entire purport of an Injunction

becomes fulfilled. This would imply that the said study may be permissible in cases of disability.

'*Foul-smelling places.*'—There should be no studying in a place where evil smell reaches the nose.

'*All*'—*i.e.*, in all cases of foul smell; *e.g.*, even when there is smell of a dead body.—(107)

VERSE CVIII.

IN A VILLAGE WHERE A CORPSE STILL LIES, IN THE PRESENCE OF LOW PEOPLE, DURING WEEPING, AND IN A CROWD OF MEN,—IT IS UNFIT FOR STUDY.—(108).

Bhāṣya.

In a village where a corpse still lies,—*i.e.*, while the corpse has not been taken away.

'*Low people.*'—This term does not stand here for the *Shūdra*; as the 'proximity of the Shūdra' has been already forbidden under 4.99. It denotes *unrighteousness*, and stands for such people as are similar to Shūdras, in their unrighteousness. Hence there is prohibition of study even in the presence of such people as are unrighteous in their conduct.

'*During weeping*,'—where the sound of weeping is heard; the participial term '*rudyamānē*' being used as a noun.

'*In a crowd of people.*'—One shall not study in a place where a large number of men have congregated on some business.

Or, the meaning may be—'*where a crowd of people are weeping*;' the prohibition applying to a place where a large number of men are weeping.

The *ātmanēpada* participial affix in '*rudyamānē*,' in the Active sense, is a Vedic anomaly.—(108)

VERSE CIX.

IN WATER, AT MIDNIGHT, DURING THE EVACUATION OF THE BLADDER AND THE BOWELS, WHILE ONE IS UNCLEAN, WHEN ONE HAS EATEN AT A SHRĀDDHA, ONE SHALL NOT EVEN THINK IN HIS MIND (OF THE VEDA).—(109)

Bhāṣya.

The fourth '*muhūrta*' of the night is '*midnight*,' which is also called '*mahāniṣhā*,' 'Deep Night.' Two '*muhūrtas*' before, and two '*muhūrtas*' after this 'midnight,' it is unfit for study.

'*In water* ;'—*i.e.*, while standing in a river or tank or some such reservoir of water. Since the context is dealing with 'Vedic study,' the repeating of Vedic texts—such as '*Agha-marṣana*,' and the rest—in water is not forbidden.

Some people read '*udayē*' for '*udakē* ;' which means that it is unfit for study when the sun has just risen.

'*Unclean* ;'—*i.e.*, while he has not washed, after having taken his food. One is also called 'unclean' before one has washed, after having evacuated the bladder or the bowels. Some people explain that the term '*unclean*' stands for all those impure conditions that require washing ; so that spitting also would become included.

'*Even in his mind*.'—This does not mean that on other occasions unfit for study, the *thinking* of Vedic texts is permitted; all that it means is that the conditions here mentioned are more serious than the rest.—(109)

VERSE CX.

AFTER HAVING ACCEPTED INVITATION TO A UNITARY FUNERAL RITE, THE LEARNED BRĀHMAṆA SHALL NOT RECITE THE VEDA FOR THREE DAYS ; AS ALSO DURING THE IMPURITY OF THE KING AND ALSO OF RĀHU.—(110)

Bhāṣya.

The 'Unitary Rite' is that which is offered to a single ancestor; *i.e.*, the fresh funeral rite (that which is performed after death) ;—having '*accepted*'—agreed to—'*invitation*' at that rite, it becomes an occasion unfit for study, for three days, counting from the day of the invitation.

Similarly, when '*of the King*'—*i.e.*, of the Moon—there is '*impurity*,' *i.e.*, pouring of nectar towards Rāhu. '*Also*' in this case, is meant to include the *Sun* also.

Or, the '*impurity of the King*' may mean the rejoicings accompaying the birth of a son to the *King*, the ruler of men ; and the '*impurity of the Rāhu*,' for the eclipses of the Sun and the Moon, known as '*grahaṇa*,' 'catching.'—(110)

VERSE CXI.

WHILE THE ODOUR AND STAIN OF A FUNERAL RITE NOT OFFERED TO HIS OWN ANCESTOR REMAIN UPON THE BODY OF A LEARNED BRĀHMAṆA, HE SHALL NOT RECITE THE VEDA.—(111)

Bhāṣya.

'*That which is not offered to his own ancestor*;'—*i.e.*, that at which uncooked food is offered ;—while of such a rite the '*odour and stain remain*,' so long he is unfit for study. This is a rule different from the forgoing rule. When on the next day, the man has bathed, and the odour has disappeared, he becomes fit for study.

What is said here is only by way of an indication. Even while the 'odour and stain' are not actually there, the man shall not study, until the food eaten has become digested.

The epithet '*learned*' reiterates the rule that it is only the learned Brāhmaṇa that is entitled to eat at funeral rites(—111).

VERSE CXII.

WHILE LYING DOWN, WHILE HIS FEET ARE PROMINENTLY THRUST FORWARD, AND WHILE HE IS SEATED WITH HIS KNEES TIED TOGETHER, HE SHALL NOT STUDY ; AS ALSO AFTER HAVING EATEN MEAT OR FOOD GIVEN BY A PERSON DURING IMPURITY. —(112).

Bhāṣya.

'*With feet prominently thrust forward*'—*i.e.*, with feet spread forward, or with one foot over the other, or with his feet placed together on a stool, etc.

'*Avasakthikā*'—is that mode of sitting in which the knees are tied together with a piece of cloth or some such thing.

'*Āmiṣa*'—is meat.

'*Impurity*'—includes that impurity also which is caused by the carrying of a dead body, etc.—(112).

VERSE CXIII.

NOR DURING A FOG, NOR DURING THE SOUND OF ARROWS, NOR AT THE TWO TWILIGHTS, NOR ON THE MOONLESS DAY, NOR ON THE FOURTEENTH DAY, NOR ON THE FULL MOON DAY, NOR ON THE EIGHTH DAY.—(113).

Bhāṣya.

'*Fog*'—when it is too dark to know the directions properly; it is also called '*dhūmikā*;' during which the atmosphere appears as if covered with vapour and dust.

'*Sound of arrows*'—whizzing of arrows.

Some people read '*vāṇa*,' in which case, *vāṇa* stands for the *Lute*; the use of this is met with in connection with the '*Mahāvrata*'-Rite. The Lute has a hundred strings, and it is also without strings.

'On the fourteenth day'—of each fortnight.

'*Eighth day*'—all the eighth days; as is clear from other Smṛti texts, as also from usage.

Others read '*aṣṭamīṣu*' (for '*aṣṭakāsu*').—(113).

VERSE CXIV.

THE MOONLESS DAY DESTROYS THE TEACHER, THE FOURTEENTH DAY DESTROYS THE PUPIL, AND THE EIGHTH DAY AND THE FULL-MOON DAYS DESTROY THE VEDA; HENCE THESE HE SHALL AVOID.—(114).

Bhāṣya.

This a commendatory supplement to the foregoing rule, and it is meant to show its obligatory character. Hence, in cases where there is nothing to indicate the obligatory character of the rule, the treating of the occasion as unfit for study is meant to be optional. The Author himself is going to add (in 127 below)—'he shall always avoid two only.'

'*These he shall avoid*'—for purposes of Vedic study.—(114).

VERSE CXV.

THE BRĀHMAṆA SHALL NOT READ DURING A DUST-STORM, OR WHILE THE SKY IS BURNING, OR WHILE JACKALS ARE HOWLING, OR WHILE DOGS OR DONKEYS OR CAMELS ARE CRYING IN A LINE.—(115).

Bhāṣya.

'*Gomāyu*'—is the jackal; the 'howling' of the jackal is its *crying*.

It is time unfit for study only when dogs, donkeys and camels are crying together in large numbers; each of these three crying along with others of the same species.—(115).

VERSE CXVI.

HE SHALL NOT STUDY NEAR THE CREMATION-GROUND, NOR NEAR THE VILLAGE, NOR IN THE COW-PASTURE, NOR WHILE DRESSED IN THE GARMENT WORN DURING SEXUAL INTERCOURSE, NOR AFTER RECEIVING PRESENTS IN CONNECTION WITH FUNERAL RITES.—(116).

Bhāṣya.

The term '*anta*' means *proximity*. The meaning is that he shall not study in close proximity to the cremation-ground, or in close proximity to a village.

'*Cow-pasture*'—where cows go to graze. Or, '*govraja*' may mean the '*cow-pen.*'

'He shall not read with the same cloth on him which he had on while having intercourse with his wife;' the term '*maithuna*' denoting, through association, the *cloth worn during intercourse.*

'*In connection with funeral rites;*'—he shall not read after having accepted such presents as dry food, and the like.—(116)

VERSE CXVII.

ANY SHRĀDDHA-GIFT, BE IT ANIMATE OR INANIMATE, IF THE BRĀHMAṆA ACCEPTS, IT BECOMES AN OCCASION UNFIT FOR STUDY; BECAUSE THE BRĀHMAṆA HAS BEEN DECLARED AS HAVING THE HAND FOR HIS MOUTH.—(117)

Bhāṣya.

The rice and other things that are given in connection with *Shrāddhas* are generally known as *'shrāddhika,'* '*shrāddha-gift* ;' and it is with a view to show that, in the present context it is not this alone that is meant, that the present verse is added ; the sense being—it is not only the acceptance of *Vrīhi*, Rice and other grains that makes the occasion unfit for study; but other things, also—be they '*animate*'—in the shape of the cow and other animals—'*or inaminate*' in the shape of pairs of cloth, etc.,—having accepted such a thing,—*i.e.*, after having touched it with his hand, at the time of acceptance—the man shall not study. Because the act itself constitutes the act of 'eating.' '*Pāṇyāsya*' is one whose hand is his mouth. What this means is the eating at a *shrāddha* and accepting gifts in connection with it —both stand on the same footing.—(117)

VERSE CXVIII.

WHEN THE VILLAGE HAS BEEN BESET WITH THIEVES, WHEN ALARM HAS BEEN CAUSED BY FIRE, IT IS UNFIT FOR STUDY, TILL THE SAME TIME NEXT DAY ; AS ALSO AT THE APPEARANCE OF ALL PORTENTS.—(118)

Bhāṣya.

'*Beset*'—attacked. One shall not study in a village where many thieves have come in for attacking.

'*Alarm.*'—When alarm has been caused by fire—*i.e.*, when fire has set in in a house, even though the house may not be entirely burnt.

'*Ākālika-anādhyāya.*'—That is, from the time that the trouble appears up to the same time next day, it is unfit for study.

'*Also at the appearance of other portents*'—heavenly, earthly and atmospheric ; *e.g.*, the floating of stones, stars visible during the day, and so forth.—(118)

VERSE CXIX.

AT THE CEREMONY OF UPĀKARMA AND AT THAT OF UTSARJANA, OMISSION OF STUDY HAS BEEN PRESCRIBED FOR THREE DAYS, BUT AT THE AṢṬAKĀṢ FOR ONE DAY AND NIGHT; AS ALSO ON THE LAST NIGHTS OF THE SEASONS.—(119)

Bhāṣya.

It has been said above (verse 97) that, at the *Utsarjana* ceremony, one night, along with the preceding and the following days, has deen declared to be unfit for study; and with that the present text lays down the option of observing 'three days.' But, in connection with the 'Upākarma,' this is the original Injunction.

'*Aṣṭakās*'—*i. e.*, the three or four eighth nights during the fortnights following after the Full-Moon of the month of *Āgrahāyaṇa.* Though it has been said above that the whole day and night is to be observed on the eighth days of all fortnights, yet its mention in the present connection is only right and proper, as emphasizing the obligatory character of the rule; and, throughout the present context, we have to regard two rules as optional only when each is found to be self-sufficient.

'*On the last nights of the seasons*;'—'one day and night' is to be construed with this also. There are six seasons; and the *day* on which one ends and the other begins, is to be regarded as unfit for study; and the mention of 'night' is only by way of an indicative.—(119).

VERSE CXX.

HE SHALL NOT RECITE THE VEDA WHILE SEATED ON A HORSE, OR A TREE, OR AN ELEPHANT, OR A BOAT, OR A DONKEY, OR A CAMEL; NOR WHEN SEATED ON BARREN GROUND, NOR WHEN GOING ON A CONVEYANCE.—(120).

Bhāṣya.

'*Barren ground*;'—such ground, outside the village, as is devoid of water and vegetation; also called '*Uṣara.*'

'*Conveyance*'—such as cart, chariot, palanquin, and the like; for one who is going on these, the reciting of the Veda is forbidden.—(120).

VERSE CXXI.

NOR DURING AN ALTERCATION, OR DURING A FIGHT; NOR IN THE MIDST OF AN ARMY, NOR DURING A BATTLE, NOR WHEN HE HAS JUST EATEN, NOR DURING INDIGESTION, NOR AFTER VOMITING, NOR WHEN THERE IS ERUCTATION.—(121)

Bhāṣya.

'*Altercation*'—a quarrel, with mutual recrimination.

'*Fight*'—in which the parties concerned strike each other with sticks and such other weapons.

'*Army*'—consisting of Elephants, Horses and Infantry.

'*Battle*'—the actual affray.

Study is forbidden for one in the midst of an army, even though it be not actually engaged in battle.

'*When he has just eaten*;'—*i.e.*, 'so long as his hands are still wet'—as mentioned in another Smṛti-text.

'*Indigestion*;'—what has been eaten on the previous day, if it still remains in the stomach, is called 'undigested.'

'*Vomiting*'—is well known.

'*Eructation*;'—even when there is no indigestion, if there is 'eructation,' that same day, or the next day.—(121).

VERSE CXXII.

NOT WITHOUT HAVING OBTAINED THE PERMISSION OF HIS GUEST, NOR WHILE THE WIND BLOWS VEHEMENTLY; NOR WHEN BLOOD HAS FLOWED FROM HIS BODY, OR HIS BODY HAS BEEN WOUNDED BY A WEAPON.—(122).

Bhāṣya.

The '*guest*' here stands for gentlemen in general. The 'guest' is a gentleman who happens to arrive by chance; and, when such a gentleman has arrived, the Veda shall be studied, but only after his permission has been obtained with

the words, 'May I proceed with my study.' Says another *Smṛti-text*—'When a gentleman has come to the house.'

When the winds blows '*vehemently*'—*i.e.*, with great force.

Objection.—"Study has already been forbidden 'when air is audible by the ear' (102), and so forth."

True. But what is meant by the present text is that when the wind blows with greater force than what has been mentioned before (in 102); or, it may refer to the wind blowing apart from the rains. That such is the meaning is indicated by the usual meaning of the root 'vā,' 'to blow,' which means *to dry up*; and wind (apart from the rains) always tends to dry up things; and in this sense, the term '*māruta*' shall stand for the constituent elements of the body; and the meaning in this case (of the term '*vāti*') shall be that—'when the constituents of the man's body have been dried up by the labours of study'; the whole phrase ('*mārutē vāti*') would thus mean—'when the wind is blowing high and the reader is emaciated,'—there being no co-ordination between the two locatives (in '*mārutē*' and '*vāti*').

When blood has flowed, through the bite of leeches and such other insects; or when blood has flowed, by reason of his body being wounded by a weapon. The term, 'from the body,' is to be construed with both clauses. (122).

VERSE CXXIII.

HE SHALL NEVER RECITE THE ṚK OR THE YAJUṢ DURING A SĀMA-CHANT; NOR AFTER HAVING READ THE END OF THE VEDA, OR AFTER HAVING READ THE ĀRAṆYAKA.—(123).

Bhāṣya.

While the Sāma-chant is being heard, one shall not recite either Ṛk verses or the Yajuṣ Mantras. This prohibition does not apply to the Brāhmaṇas appertaining to the Ṛgveda and the Yajurveda; but the prohibition does apply to the reading of such *Ṛk* and *Yajuṣ* Mantras as happen to

be contained in the *Panchavimsha Brāhmaṇa* (of the Sāma-Veda).

'*End of the Veda*;'—*i.e.*, when the Veda comes to an end. This refers to the end of the Mantra (Samhitā) Text, as also to that of the Brāhmaṇa Text.

'*Āraṇyaka*' is the name of a portion of the Veda; after having read this, one should not read any other book.—(123)

VERSE CXXIV.

THE ṚGVEDA IS SACRED TO THE GODS AND THE YAJURVEDA IS HUMAN; THE SĀMAVEDA HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE RELATED TO THE PITṚS; HENCE ITS SOUND IS IMPURE.—(124)

Bhāṣya.

It has been declared that when Sāma-Veda is being chanted, the time is unfit for the reciting of the Ṛgveda and the Yajurveda. Supplementary to this, we have the present statement.

'*Sacred to the gods*;'—*i.e.*, that of which the gods are the presiding genius; that is, which consists entirley of hymns to the gods. As a matter of fact, hymns form the principal part of the Ṛgveda; it is for this reason that it is called '*sacred to the gods*.'

As a matter of fact, action forms the predominating element in Men; and, since the Yajurveda is made up principally of injunctions regarding *Action*, the Yajurveda is, on account of this analogy, said to be '*human*.' The term '*mānuṣa*' denotes the genus 'man;' and, by a process of identification, the Yajurveda has been called '*human*.'

'*Related to the Pitṛs*'—may be taken to mean—either 'beneficial to the Pitṛs,' or 'of which the Pitṛs are the presiding genius;' by some sort of relationship, the Sāma-Veda has been called 'related to the Pitṛs.'

There are three regions, and of these there, are three presiding beings: the gods of Heaven, the Men of the Earth

and the *Pitṛs* of the sky. Similarly, there are three Vedas; and, since two of these have been spoken of as related to 'gods' and 'men,' respectively, the third, Sāma Veda, is, by a process of elimination, declared to be '*related to the Pitṛs*.'

'*Its sound is impure*'.—The sound of the Sāmaveda should not be understood, by this, to be really impure; all that is meant is that, just as Veda should not be recited in the presence of an impure substance, so should it not be recited in the presence of the Sāma-chant; it is on the ground of this similarity to 'impure substances' that the sound of Sāma has been said to be 'impure.'

From the context it is clear that this prohibition during Sāma-chant pertains to the reciting of the Ṛgveda and the Yajurveda in course of the regular 'Vedic study' that has been prescribed; and not to the reciting of Mantra-texts that is done in the course of scrifical performances.—(124)

VERSE CXXV.

KNOWING THIS, THE LEARNED DAILY RECITE FIRST THE ESSENCE OF THE THREE VEDAS, IN DUE ORDER; AND IT IS ONLY AFTER THIS THAT THEY RECITE THE VEDA.—(125)

Bhāṣya.

'*Knowing this*',—*i.e.*, the connection of the Vedas with the presiding beings of the three Regions, as described in the preceding verse;—'*the learned*'—wise men—'*first*'—'*recite the essence of the three Vedas*'—in the shape of (1) the syllable '*om*,' (2) the *Vyāhṛtis* (the syllables, '*bhūḥ bhuvaḥ—svaḥ*') and (3) the 'Sāvitrī' verse—in this '*order*;'—and '*after this they recite the Veda.*' By the reciting of the said three 'essences,' all the three regions and the three presiding beings become comprehended.

Though this matter has already been asserted in Discourse II, yet it is repeated here; and this with a view to emphasise the fact that—'just as one does not recite the Veda at a time that is unfit for study, so also should he not recite it until

he has previously recited *the essence of the three Vedas.'*
—(125).

VERSE CXXVI.

WHEN CATTLE, A FROG, A CAT, A DOG, A SNAKE, A MONGOOSE OR A RAT COME BETWEEN,—ONE SHOULD REGARD THE DAY AND NIGHT AS UNFIT FOR STUDY.—(126)

Bhāṣya.

'*Come between*'—between the teacher and the pupil, or among the several students themselves.

'*Aharnisham*'—Day and night.

Gautama (1.59), however, has declared—'Fasting and living outside for three days has been laid down;' and the same holds good regarding reading in the cremation-ground.

What is laid down in the present text is to be regarded as an option to what has been declared by Gautama—(126)

VERSE CXXVII.

THE TWICE-BORN MAN SHALL ALWAYS CAREFULLY AVOID ONLY TWO CONDITIONS AS UNFIT FOR STUDY: VIZ. AN UNCLEAN PLACE OF STUDY AND HIS OWN UNCLEAN CONDITION.—(127)

Bhāṣya.

The mention of '*always*' here shows that the aforesaid occasions are to be regarded as 'unfit for study,' only optionally; among these also those that are obligatory have already been indicated; *e.g.*, whenever the term 'always' occurs; it has also been shown where what is stated is purely descriptive; *e.g.*, verse 114.

The place is regarded as '*unclean*' when it is in contact with such unclean things as bones, the generative organs, and so forth.

The conditions that make the man himself 'unclean' shall be described in Discourse V.

Though the present conditions of 'unfitness for study,' are mentioned in the context dealing with 'Vedic Study,' yet

they are, in reality, permanently 'unfit for study;' for the simple reason that the unclean man is not entitled to any act; as says the Brāhmaṇa—'For the sacrifice, there are two conditions that make it *unfit*—when the man himself, or the place, is unclean.' The sacrifice here referred to is the '*Brahmayajña*,' the daily reciting of Vedic mantras.—(127).

SECTION XIII.—OTHER DUTIES.

VERSE CXXVIII.

ON THE MOONLESS DAY, ON THE EIGHTH, ON THE FULL MOON DAY, AND ON THE FOURTEENTH, THE TWICE-BORN ACCOMPLISHED STUDENT SHALL ALWAYS REMAIN A "RELIGIOUS STUDENT," EVEN DURING THE "SEASON."—(128)

Bhāṣya.

'*Shall remain a Religious Student.*'—Abstention from congugal infercourse is among the duties of the Religious Student; and it is this that is meant here; and not the other duties of begging food, and so forth. Specially, as the phrase 'even during the season' brings to mind that one duty first of all.

Others hold that, during the days mentioned, the eating of honey and meat is also meant to be avoided. In support of this view, it is necessary to quote another *Smṛti*-text: 'The use of oil, meat, the female generative organ and the razor is to be avoided on the sixth, on the Moonless Day, on the fourteenth of both fortnights and on the Full Moon Day.'

Others, again, have offered the following explanation:—"'Religious Student' is the name given to a person in a particular life-stage; hence, when it is applied to the Householder and persons in other life-stages, it becomes simply indicative of that peculiar characteristic of the Religious Student which consists in the performance of duties conducive to Vedic Study; this is the case with the expression, 'should remain a Religious Student.' When the name of one thing is applied to another, it denotes *similarity*; and, in accordance with this principle, the expression would mean the adoption of all the duties of the Religious Student,—such as begging for food, tending of the Fire, and so forth. But the presence of such directions as, 'all this should be done *till the ceremony*

of Return' (2.108), and 'the Householder shall eat the remnants,' clearly preclude the said duties of 'begging for food' and the like (which would be incompatiable with the duty of 'eating the remnants') [and the other duties are clearly laid down as to be observed only *till the ceremony of Return*]. So that, the expression in question can only indicate the avoiding of Honey, Meat and Sexual Intercourse (which is among the duties of the Religious Student, and is compatible with the life of the Householder)."

But there is not much in all this; since the term, 'Religious Student,' is generally used in the sense of 'avoiding sexual intercourse.'—(128)

VERSE CXXIX.

HE SHALL NOT BATHE AFTER A MEAL, NOR WHEN HE IS ILL, NOR AT MIDNIGHT, NOR ALONG WITH HIS GARMENTS; AND NEVER IN AN UNKNOWN WATER-RESERVOIR.—(129)

Bhāṣya

This prohibition does not apply to the daily bath; since there is no possibility of its ever being done after the meals; specially, as in another *Smṛti-text*, the order of sequence has been distinctly laid down as—'(1) Bath, (2) the Great Sacrifices and (3) the Eating of Remnants.' Nor can the prohibition apply to the bath necessitated by touching of the Chāṇḍāla and such other circumstances; because such a prohibition would be contrary to the general law that 'one shall not remain impure for a single moment.' From all this it follows that the prohibition applies to that purely voluntary bathing which one has recourse to for the relieving of heat and perspiration, etc.

'*Ill*'—suffering from some disease. For the sick person, all kinds of bath have been forbidden, even when he may have become unclean; specially in view of the direction that 'one shall protect himself from all things.'

Question—"How would such a man be purified?"

Answer—He shall sprinkle water over his body, or wipe off his body with Mantras, or change his clothes, and so forth.

'*Midnight,*' '*Mahānishā* ;'—*i.e.*, Four '*muhūrtas,*' two on each side of midnight.

Some people explain the term '*mahānishā*' as '*Long Night,*' such as we have during the winter.

But this explanation (by which bathing during winter-nights would be forbidden) would be contrary to the Injunction that lays down early morning bath during the (winter) months of *Māgha* and *Phālguna* ; and as such, it must be regarded as a wrong explanation. Nor is there any ground for restricting the prohibition to *winter nights* only ; specially as the text does not contain a second '*nishā*' (which alone could afford the sense, 'during the night of those months when nights are long.')

'*Along with his garments.*'—This implies that the prohibition applies to the case where, during the cold weather, a man is wearing several pieces of clothes ; especially bathing with one piece of cloth on is what has been already enjoined by such directions as 'he shall not bathe naked' (4.45) ;—When he is wearing *two* pieces of cloth, there is uncertainty, he may or may not bathe ;—but when he has several pieces on, he shall not bathe.

'*Water-reservoir*'—containing water ;—'*unknown*'—*i.e.*, with regard to which it is not known whether it is deep or not deep, or whether there are, or are not, allegators in it.

'*Ajasram*'—ever, always.—(129)

VERSE CXXX.

HE SHALL NOT INTENTIONALLY STEP OVER THE SHADOW OF THE GODS, OF A SUPERIOR, OF THE KING, OF AN ACCOMPLISHED STUDENT, OF HIS OWN PRECEPTOR, OF THE TAWNY THING, OR OF THE INITIATED PERSON.—(130)

Bhāṣya.

'*Gods*' here stands for *Images* ; as these alone can cast shadows.

'*Superior*'—*i.e.*, his father.

'*Preceptor*'—one who has performed for him the Initiatory Ceremony.

These two have been mentioned separately, with a view to show that this additional respect is to be shown to the two persons concerned, not simply because they are to be treated as 'superiors,' [but because they are, by their distinctive character, entitled to this additional form of respect].

Hence, what is here prescribed does not apply to the maternal uncle and such other persons.

Some people assert that "such a view would be contrary to usage; hence the separate mention of the two ('superior' and 'preceptor') has to be explained as anologous to such expressions as '*gobalīvarda*,' 'bovine bull' (where the tautology indicates some sort of distinctive superiority).

'*Tawny*' is the reddish-brown colour; it stands here for a substance possessed of that colour; in the present context it stands for either the *tawny cow* or the *Soma-creeper*; the term '*babhru*' ('tawny') being found in the Veda to be applied to both these things.

'*Intentionally*.'—This means that if it is done unintentionally, there is no wrong done.—(130)

VERSE CXXXI.

HE SHALL NOT HAVE RECOURSE TO A CROSS-ROAD AT MIDDAY, OR AT MIDNIGHT, OR AFTER HAVING PARTAKEN OF MEAT-FOOD AT A SHRĀDDHA, OR AT THE TWO TWILIGHTS.—(131)

Bhāṣya.

At midday—at midnight—after having eaten, at a Shrāddha, food mixed with meat—'*he shall not have recourse to a cross-road*;' *i.e.*, shall not stay there for any length of time. If, however, on his way to another village, there is no other way save through the cross-road, his having recourse to it to that extent is not forbidden.

Some people add a further '*cha*,' and explain the text to mean, 'after having eaten at a *shrāddha*, *and* after having partaken of meat-food.'

Under this explanation, however, it would be necessary to seek for some usage in support of this; as without some such corroborative usage, there can be no justification for such disjointed construction.—(131)

VERSE CXXXII.

HE SHALL NOT INTENTIONALLY STAND UPON UNGUENT-POWDER, OR UPON USED WATER, OR ON URINE OR ORDURE, OR ON BLOOD, OR ON MUCUS, SPITTINGS AND VOMITINGS.—(132)

Bhāṣya.

'*Unguent-powder*,'—such powder, etc., as are used for removing dirt from the body.

'*Used water*'—water that has been used for bathing, etc.

'*Spittings*.'—Even apart from the mucus, in which form spittings are generally thrown out; such things, for instance, as the betel-leaf and other things, of which the juices have been eaten up and the tasteless substance is thrown out.

'*Standing upon*' means *stepping upon*.

'*Intentionally*.'—There is no harm if it is done unintentionally.—(132)

VERSE CXXXIII.

HE SHALL NOT PAY ATTENTION TO HIS ENEMY, OR TO HIS ENEMY'S FRIEND, OR TO AN UNRIGHTEOUS PERSON, OR TO A THIEF, OR TO THE LADY OF ANOTHER PERSON.—(133)

Bhāṣya.

To his enemy, he shall not send presents,—he shall not sit or stand in the same place with him,—he shall not go home in his company,—he shall not carry on conversation with him, and so forth.

'*Unrighteous person*,'—a sinner, *i.e.*, one who maintains himself by bad livelihood.

'*Thief*'—one who steals things. It is this separate mention of the 'thief' which implies that *all* 'unrighteous' persons are not meant to be avoided, but only those mentioned above (those living by evil ways of living).

'*The lady of another person.*'—The use of the term '*lady*' ('*yoṣit*') and not 'wife' ('*patnī*') is meant to show that one shall avoid, not only the married wife, but also the 'kept' woman; because paying attention to both equally leads to enmity; and the present prohibition is based upon visible (ordinary worldly) considerations. In the next verse, we have the term '*wife*,' ('*dārā*'), which is meant to indicate the excessive spiritual wrong involved. It would not be right to assert that—"the general term 'lady' in the present verse is restricted in its extension by the term 'wife' in the next verse, which is supplementary to this one." Because, as a matter of fact, the next is *not* supplementary to the present verse, which stands distinct by itself.—(133)

VERSE CXXXIV.

In this world, there is nothing so detrimental to a man's longevity as paying attention to the wife of another person.—(134)

Bhāṣya.

Any such thing as the eating of indigestible food, the stealing of gold, etc., '*is not so detrimental to a man's longevity*'—which cuts short his life to the same extent—as intercourse with another person's wife This involves both temporal and spiritual wrong.—(134)

VERSE CXXXV.

Desiring his own prosperity, he shall never despise a Kṣattriya, a serpent, a learned Brāhmaṇa,—even if they be feeble.—(135)

Bhāṣya.

'*Despising*' means disrespect, *want of respect*, as also actual ill-treatment.

'*Even if they be feeble*'—and, hence, unable to show any form of friendliness.—(135)

VERSE CXXXVI.

BECAUSE THESE THREE, WHEN DESPISED, MAY DESTROY THE MAN,—THEREFORE, THE INTELLIGENT MAN SHALL NEVER DESPISE THESE THREE.—(136)

Bhāṣya.

'*The man*'—*i.e.*, he who does the despising.

'*These three, when despised.*'—The Kṣattriya and the snake destroy a man with their visible (physical) power, while the *Brāhmaṇa* does it by means of incantations and oblations, as also by means of the spiritual wrong involved in his ill-treatment.

'*Therefore these three &c.*'—This sums up the whole thing. Having indicated the evil involved, the Author has added this summing up, with a view to show that what is here mentioned is to be avoided with special care; and from the great care thus enjoined it follows that the act here prohibited involves a correspondingly serious Expiatory Rite also.—(136)

VERSE CXXXVII.

HE SHALL NOT DESPISE HIMSELF BY REASON OF FORMER FAILURES. UNTIL DEATH, HE SHOULD SEEK FORTUNE, AND HE SHOULD NEVER THINK HER UNATTAINABLE.—(137)

Bhāṣya.

'*Failure*'—non-acquisition of wealth, by agriculture and such other means.

'*He shall not despise himself,*'—regarding himself as 'unfortunate,' as a 'sinner,'—'I have not obtained wealth at this time, at what time shall I obtain it?'—He shall not ponder, in this fashion, over his failure.

'*Until death, he should seek fortune;*'—*i.e.*, to his very last breath, he should not renounce the desire for acquiring wealth.

'*He should not regard her as unattainable.*'—Having formed the determination, 'My attempt shall surely succeed,' he shall not mind the evil aspects of planets or other disheartening circumstances, and shall proceed to take steps to earn wealth. In this connection, there is a saying—'It is only persons devoid of manly courage that seek to examine the aspect of planets; there is nothing unattainable for such persons as are endowed with courage and energy.'

What is meant by this is as follows:—He who broods in the following manner—'I am in a sorry plight, I can obtain wealth, with difficulty, I am not entitled to the setting up of Fire and other rites, and therefore I am freed from the necessity of undergoing the trouble of performing the Agnihotra and other rites'—does not think rightly; consequently, one shall always try to acquire wealth.—(137)

VERSE CXXXVIII.

HE SHALL SAY WHAT IS TRUE; AND HE SHALL SAY WHAT IS AGREEABLE; HE SHALL NOT SAY WHAT IS TRUE, BUT DISAGREEALE; NOR SHALL HE SAY WHAT IS AGREEABLE, BUT UNTRUE; THIS IS THE ETERNAL LAW.—(138)

Bhāṣya.

In regard to what a man may be called upon to speak, he is restricted to telling the truth. The '*true*' is that which is in strict accordance with what is seen and heard.

'*He shall say what is agreeable.*'—This is a second injunction. It is only right to describe the nobility and other good qualities of a person, even without any purpose. Then again, it would be right to speak to a person of the birth of his son—'O Brāhmaṇa, a son has been born to you'—if it were true; even though the speeker may not have any motive of his own in conveying the information; if it is not known to him already.

What is 'true' may be 'agreeable' as well as 'disagreeable.' An example of the 'agreeable truth' has been already

shown, in the form of the assertion, 'O Brāhmaṇa, a son has been born to you.' An example of the 'disagreeable truth' we have in the form of the assertion, 'Your maiden daughter is with child'. If this be *untrue*, it should not be spoken of, of course; but even if it be true, the fact of a virgin being with child is something that should not be spoken of. In such cases, if the man can help it, he should remain silent.

People might be led to think that, even when the girl is pregnant, it would be right to say, 'she is not pregnant,' as such an assertion would be 'agreeable;'—with a view to this, the Author has added—'*He shall not say what is agreeable, but untrue;*' so that for the man who is the first to notice the signs of pregnancy in the girl, it would not do to remain silent.

'*This is the eternal law.*'—The Veda is eternal, hence the law laid down in the Veda is also eternal.—(138)

VERSE CXXXIX.

WHAT IS (NOT) WELL HE SHALL CALL "WELL"; OR, HE SHALL SIMPLY SAY "WELL;" HE SHALL NOT CREATE NEEDLESS ENMITY OR DISPUTE WITH ANY ONE.—(139)

Bhāṣya.

The first '*bhadra*' (well) they have explained as with the negative particle understood; the sense being—'what is not well, he shall call *well.*'

The particle '*iti*' (after '*bhadran*') is meant to be indicative; the meaning being that "one shall make use of such agreeable words as '*Kalyāṇam*' (welfare), '*maṅgalam*' (auspicious), '*siddhan*' (accomplished), '*shrēyaḥ*' (good), and so forth.

If we regard the first term '*bhadran*' also as indicative of like words, the meaning would be—'If a man is blind, he should be spoken of as *with eyes*; if he is illiterate, he should be spoken as *learned*' and so forth.

Or, in all these cases, '*he shall simply say "well."*'

'*Needless enmity.*'—When there is no monetary or other interest involved, he shall not make use of words in a mere bravado.

Similarly, he shall not create dispute in the king's court. The epithet '*needless*' applies to this also.

'*With any one*'—*i.e.*, even with a weaker party.—(139)

VERSE CXL.

HE SHALL NOT GO ABOUT EITHER TOO EARLY IN THE MORNING OR TOO LATE IN THE EVENING, OR JUST AT MIDDAY; NOR WITH AN UNKNOWN PERSON, NOR ALONE, NOR WITH SHŪDRAS.—(140)

Bhāṣya.

The term '*atikalya*' denotes *day-break*. 'One shall not go about at dawn.'

'*Too late in the evening*'—at the time of the evening twilight.

'*He shall not go about with an unknown person, or without a companion, or with shūdras.*'—(140)

VERSE CXLI.

HE SHALL NOT INSULT THOSE WHO HAVE REDUNDANT LIMBS, OR THOSE WHO ARE DEFICIENT IN LIMBS, OR THOSE DESTITUTE OF LEARNING, OR THOSE WHO ARE FAR ADVANCED IN AGE, OR THOSE DESTITUTE OF BEAUTY OR WEALTH, OR THOSE OF LOW BIRTH.—(141)

Bhāṣya.

'*Those who are deficient in limbs*;'—*e.g.*, the one-eyed person, the leper, the dwarf, and so forth.

'*Those who have redundant limbs*;'—that is persons suffering from elephantiasis and such diseases.

'*Destitute of learning*'—Illiterate.

'*Far advanced in age*'—*i.e.*, very old persons.

'*Destitute of beauty*;'—*i.e.*, persons with a flat nose or with a squint eye, and so forth.

'*Destitute of wealth*'—poor; devoid of wealth, riches.

'*Of low birth*'—persons whose birth is defective; *e.g.*, the '*kuṇḍa*' (one born of his mother's paramour during his

father's life-time), the '*golaka*' (one so born, after his father's death), and so forth.

'These *he shall not insult*.'—'Insulting' means *despising*; the mere act of calling these persons by these names would be an 'insult.'—(141)

VERSE CXLII.

A BRĀHMAṆA, WHILE UNCLEAN, SHALL NOT TOUCH, WITH HIS HAND, A COW, A BRĀHMAṆA OR FIRE. NOR SHALL HE, BEING IN GOOD HEALTH, LOOK AT THE LUMINARIES IN THE SKY, WHILE HE IS IMPURE.—(142)

Bhāṣya.

'*Unclean*;'—*i.e.*, not washed after having eaten; or, after having evacuated the bladder or the bowels. The term '*uchchhiṣṭa*' here stands simply for '*impure*;' and it is in this sense that the '*uchchhiṣṭa*' person is forbidden to touch the cow, etc. The expiatory rite in connection with this forbidden touching is going to be prescribed in the next verse, where the term '*ashuchi*,' 'impure,' is used.

No significance attaches to the term '*hand*'; as touching with any other part of the body also is not desirable. The prohibition, however, does not apply to the case where one interposes a piece of cloth.

'*He shall not look at the luminaries in the sky*.'—'*Being in good health*.'—*i.e.*, under normal conditions.—The addition of the pharse, '*in the sky*,' indicates that the prohibition does not apply to looking at the 'luminary *on the earth*'—*i.e.*, the fire.—(142)

VERSE CXLIII.

HAVING TOUCHED THESE, WHILE IMPURE, HE SHALL ALWAYS WIPE WITH WATER, WITH HIS PALM, HIS SENSE-ORGANS, AS ALSO HIS LIMBS AND THE NAVEL.—(143)

Bhāṣya.

Though the text uses the general term 'sense-organs,' yet what are meant are the eyes and the other organs located in

the head. The term '*prāṇa*' is found to be used in the sense of *sense-organs* in the Veda, where, in the *Upaniṣads*, the origin of sense-organs has been described.

'*Limbs*'—ankles, knees, feet, and so forth.

'*With the palm*' he shall take up water and then touch the organs &c.—(143)

VERSE CXLIV.

UNLESS HE BE IN TROUBLE, HE SHALL NOT, WITHOUT CAUSE, TOUCH HIS CAVITIES. HE SHALL ALSO AVOID ALL SECRET HAIRS.—(144)

Bhāṣya.

'*Without cause*'—*i.e.*, except when called upon to scratch them.

'*His cavities*'—the eye, &c.,—he shall not touch.

'*Secret*'—situated in the arm-pits and over the generative organs.

'*He shall avoid*'—*i.e.*, the *touching* mentioned before. A new verb has been used for the purpose of filling up the metre. Others say that the new verb shows that what is prohibited is the *looking at* the hairs.—(144)

VERSE CXLV.

HE SHALL BE INTENT UPON AUSPICIOUS CUSTOMS, WITH HIS MIND UNDER CONTROL AND THE SENSES SUBJUGATED; AND HE SHALL, UNTIRED, DAILY RECITE PRAYERS AND OFFER OBLATIONS INTO THE FIRE.—(145)

Bhāṣya.

'*Auspiciousness*' consists in the accomplishment of such desirable things as long life, wealth, and so forth;—the '*custom*' is conducive to this—such as the wearing of the *gorochanā*-mark on the forehead, the touching of good fruit, and so forth;—on such custom he shall be '*intent*'; *i.e.*, he shall always follow such customs.

"The authority of *customs* has already been asserted before."

True. But what is asserted here is custom pertaining to non-physical ends. If those acts were done with a view to visible results, then it would so happen that the acts would sometimes fail to bring about the desired result, and this would lead the man to neglect them. It is for this purpose that the thing is reiterated here. Just as in connection with the time of starting on a journey, we shall have the reiteration of such acts as the saluting of cows and other similar things, looking at white garments, the singing of *kapiñjala*-birds to the right, the crowing of the crow to the right on a fruit-laden tree. All these acts shall be done for the sake of one's welfare; and acts contrary to these shall be avoided.

'*With senses subjugated*'—without hankering for the objects of sense. Though this has been often repeated, as being something desirable for man, yet it is mentioned here with a view to save the man from falling into sin.

Since oblation may be offered elsewhere also, the text has specially mentioned the 'fire.'

'*Untired.*'—This only reiterates what has been said before.—(145)

VERSE CXLVI.

FOR THOSE WHO ARE EVER INTENT UPON AUSPICIOUS CUSTOMS, WHO HAVE THEIR MIND UNDER CONTROL, AND WHO GO ON RECITING PRAYERS AND OFFERING OBLATIONS,—THERE IS NO CALAMITY.—(146)

Bhāṣya.

'*Calamity*'—supernatural troubles arising from natural portents,—such as sickness, loss of wealth, separation from loved ones, and so forth. All this is precluded from people who observe the auspicious customs.

This indicates the obligatory character of the acts, even though they are done with a view to a definite end. No one ever actually seeks for the cessation of supernatural troubles; hence, the term '*ever*' is purely reiterative; the meaning

being that, even though there may be some persons who may not seek it, yet the rule is entirely obligatory. So that, by doing the act, the man fulfils two ends—he fulfils an obligatory duty and also avoids calamity.—(146)

VERSE CXLVII.

HE SHALL DILIGENTLY RECITE THE VEDA, WHENEVER HE FINDS TIME. THEY DECLARE THIS TO BE HIS PRIMARY DUTY; EVERYTHING ELSE IS DECLARED TO BE HIS SECONDARY DUTY.—(147)

Bhāṣya.

It has been said above that he should recite and offer oblations; and now he states the means of doing the *reciting*.—'*He shall recite the Veda*' The rest of the verse is purely commendatory.

'*Whenever he finds time*'—the *Avyayībhāva* compound '*yathākālam*' signifying *repetition*. The meaning is that 'whenever the man happens to be free from all worldly activity, he should recite the Veda.' The other duties—such as the performance of the *Agnihotra* and the like—have their fixed time; while for *recitation*, *purity* is the only condition.

This is the '*primary duty*;' all else is '*secondary duty*;'—'*upadharma*' means 'nearly as good as duty.' This compound, therefore, is *Tatpuruṣa*, and not *Avyayībhāva*,—according to Pāṇini 2.1.55.

This deprecation of other duties is meant to be a praise of Vedic recitation, and it is not meant to be a prohibition of those.—(147)

VERSE CXLIII.

BY THE CONSTANT RECITATION OF THE VEDA, BY PURIFICATION, BY AUSTERITY, AND BY DOING NO HARM TO LIVING BEINGS, HE REMEMBERS HIS PREVIOUS BIRTH.—(148)

Bhāṣya.

'*Adroha*'—doing no harm.

'*Living beings*'—moveable as well as immoveable.

The four acts mentioned bring about their result in the form of the remembrance of previous births; and they are to be performed throughout one's life.

'*Jāti*'—another birth.

'*Paurvikī*'—foregoing, previous.—(149).

VERSE CXLIX.

RECOLLECTING HIS FORMER BIRTHS, THE TWICE-BORN PERSON CONTINUES TO STUDY THE VEDA; AND BY HIS CONTINUOUS STUDY OF THE VEDA, HE OBTAINS ABSOLUTE, ENDLESS BLISS.—(149)

Bhāṣya.

"Every man undertakes an action only when he desires to accomplish thereby something desirable. The recollection of former births, however, cannot be entirely pleasant. Why then is this described as the result following Vedic Study and the other three acts?"

In view of this question, the Author says—'*Recollecting his former births, he continues to study the Veda*,' *i.e.*, he acquires faith in it; the idea being—'Vedic study is such a good thing that it has enabled me to remember my other births.' Hence, recollecting his other births, he again betakes himself to that study; and from this continuous Vedic study extending over several lives, '*he obtains*'—acquires—'*bliss*'—in the form of the 'attainment of Brahman':—'*absolute*'—*i.e.*, without the chance of returning. The term '*endless*' indicates a particular kind of bliss,—the self-sufficient complete satisfaction of the Soul; and the eternal character of this bliss is what is expressed by the term '*ajasram*,' '*absolute*;' the meaning being that 'such and such a bliss is attained, and it never perishes.' Though the two terms ('absolute' and endless') are synonymous, yet they are not entirely tautological. Just as, in the case of the expression, '*vṛttakam vahataḥ purīṣam*,' or '*vṛttakam udakam purīṣam*,'—where one (the term '*vṛttakam*') is the conventional and the other ('*purīṣam*') the literal or etymological name of the thing;

'*purīṣam*' denotes, literally, *that which fills*, so that this latter stands for the *solid*, and the former for the *liquid*, ordure.—(149)

VERSE CL.

ON SPECIAL DAYS, HE SHALL ALWAYS OFFER THE OBLATIONS TO SAVITṚ, AND ALSO THE PACIFICATORY OBLATIONS; ON THE "AṢṬAKAS," AND ON THE "ANVAṢṬAKAS" HE SHALL ALWAYS WORSHIP THE PITṚS.'—(150)

Bhāṣya.

The exact forms of the afore-mentioned oblations are now described.

'*Oblations to Savitṛ.*'—Those that are offered to Savitṛ as the deity.

'*Special days*;'—*i.e.*, on the Moonless and the Full Moon Days—the said oblations are to be offered.

'*Pacificatory oblations*;'—the oblations that are offered for the purpose of averting evil.

At all these oblations, Clarified Butter is to be the substance offered; for, in regard to all oblations, it has been declared that, where no substance is specified, Clarified Butter is to be used, by such passages as—'what is called Clarified Butter is used at all sacrifices.'

The Locative ending in '*parvasu*' ('on special days') has the force of the Accusative; as the *receptacle* (which is what is denoted by the Locative) of the oblation is Fire, which is never the *object*; the *objects* offered being mentioned as—'fried grain,' 'butter,' 'meat,' 'mixed flour,' 'curd,' 'milk' and 'grains.'

These oblations are mentioned here for the first time, and the exact procedure of these has been described before, as learnt from usage.

'*Aṣṭakā.*'—The three eighth days of the three dark fortnights following after the Full Moon Day of the month of '*Āgrahāyaṇa*;' according to some, it stands for the four

eighth days of the four dark fortnights during the *Hēmanta* and *Shishira seasons.*—On these days, '*he shall worship the pitṛs*'—by means of *shraddha* ; the term '*pitṛ,*' standing for one's dead ancestors —'*Anvaṣṭakā*' is the name of the ninth days following the aforesaid '*aṣṭakās.*'—(150).

VERSE CLI.

FAR FROM THE DWELLING-PLACE SHALL HE PERFORM URINATION, FAR OFF HE SHALL PERFORM FEET-WASHING, AND FAR AWAY HE SHALL DO THE THROWING OF THE LEAVINGS OF FOOD.—(151)

Bhāṣya.

The water with which the feet are washed is called '*feet-washing* ;' this he shall throw far away. Or, the washing of the feet itself may be done far off.

'*Niṣēka*' is *throwing.* As a matter of fact, the water used in bathing after oiling the body, may also be called '*niṣēka*' But what is forbidden is the throwing of all kinds of *leavings*; as it is this that is more generally spoken of as '*niṣēka.*'—(151).

VERSE CLII.

IN THE FORENOON, HE SHALL PERFORM THE EVACUATION OF BOWELS, TOILETTE, BATH, CLEANING OF THE TEETH, DYING OF THE EYES, AND THE WORSHIP OF THE GODS.—(152)

Bhāṣya.

Among Vedic passages describing the limbs of animals, the excretory organ is called '*Mitra* ;' taking the term '*Mitra*' in the same sense here also, its derivative '*maitra*' is taken to mean the 'clearing of the excretory organ'.

'*Toilette*'—dressing of the hair, painting, and so forth.

Or, the two terms '*maitram*' and '*prasādhanam*' may be construed together, as noun and adjective, which would mean that, even without passing any faeces, one should wash his excretory organ, just as the washing of the mouth after sleep has been prescribed as necessary, in view of the fact that, during sleep, saliva is sure to flow out ; similarly, even in

the absence of any direct reason, it is necessary to wash the mouth as also the lower limbs of the body.

Others explain that '*maitra*' means 'the act of a *maitra*, friend', the *friendly act*; and what the text means is that 'friendly acts should be done before all other, even the most entimately necessary, acts'; but the precedence to be given is only over the acts that one may do for his own benefit, and *not* those that have to be done for the sake of cleanliness. In this case, the term '*forenoon*' would mean only *precedence over the other acts*, and not the *exclusion of the afternoon*.

Or again, 'Mitra' may stand for the sun; and '*Maitra*' in that case would mean 'the worshipping of the Sun.'—(152)

VERSES CLIII-CLV.

ON THE PARVAS HE SHOULD GO TO THE GODS, AND TO THE RIGHTEOUS BRĀHMAṆAS, TO THE KING FOR PROTECTION, AND ALSO TO THE SUPERIORS.—(153)

HE SHALL SALUTE THE ELDERS AND GIVE UP HIS OWN SEAT TO THEM; HE SHALL WAIT UPON THEM WITH JOINED HANDS; AND WHEN THEY DEPART, HE SHALL FOLLOW BEHIND THEM.—(154).

HE SHALL, IN HIS ACTION, DILIGENTLY ATTEND TO RIGHT CONDUCT WHICH IS THE ROOT OF RIGHTEOUSNESS ORDAINED IN THE SHRUTI AND SMṚTI.—(155)

[Medhātithi has nothing to say on these verses, 153-155.]

VERSE CLVI.

BY RIGHT CONDUCT HE ATTAINS LONGEVITY; BY RIGHT CONDUCT HE OBTAINS DESIRABLE CHILDREN; BY RIGHT CONDUCT HE OBTAINS INEXHAUSTIBLE WEALTH; AND RIGHT CONDUCT DESTROYS EVERYTHING INAUSPICIOUS.—(156)

Bhāṣya.

It is not meant that the child is made equipped with learning and other good qualities; in fact, such qualities are considered desirable in children. Says an old text—'What is to be done with the cow that does not give milk nor bear

calf; what is the use of a son being born who is neither learned nor righteous?.'

'*Inexhaustible*'—vast; which cannot become exhausted, even through vices.

'*Everything inauspicious*;'—such marks as a black spot on the shoulder, and the like, which are indications of poverty, misfortune, etc. This also is destroyed by Right Conduct.

Thus all that is unrighteous and evil is destroyed, if a man sticks to Right Conduct.—(156)

VERSES CLVII & CLVIII.

THE MAN OF EVIL CONDUCT BECOMES DEPRECATED AMONG MEN; HE IS CONSTANTLY SUFFERING PAIN, IS SICK AND SHORT-LIVED. —(157)

EVEN THOUGH DEVOID OF ALL AUSPICIOUS MARKS, THE MAN WHO FOLLOWS RIGHT CONDUCT, HAS FAITH AND IS FREE FROM JEALOUSY, LIVES FOR A HUNDRED YEARS—(158)

[Medhātithi has nothing to say on these verses].

VERSE CLIX.

HE SHALL CAREFULLY AVOID EVERY SUCH ACT AS IS DEPENDENT UPON OTHERS; SUCH ACTS AS ARE DEPENDENT UPON HIMSELF, EVERY ONE OF THESE HE SHALL EAGERLY PURSUE.—(159)

Bhāṣya.

An act, securing a benefit for others by requesting other (wealthy) persons, is what is spoken of as '*dependent upon others*;' and this has to be avoided; and not such acts as are dependent upon one's own conduct; such, *e.g.*, as *straightforwardness*, and the like; because these are entirely under one's own control; in fact, it is in view of this that the man accepts payment for services rendered.

This text is not meant to forbid all those acts that are done for the Initiated Sacrificer by the Priests in return for payment, and are, in that sense 'dependent on others.' This

cannot be the sense, because the Smṛti could not set aside what has been ordained by the Shruti (such as the Sacrificial acts are); specially as room for the application of the Smṛti-rule (contained in the present text) is available in the case of the acts mentioned before.

What is dependent upon oneself,—*e. g.*, the helping of others with small amounts of money, and so forth—should always be done.

In the event of one's inability to perfom one's obligatory duties, and in the event also of one's not possessing wealth enough for the maintaining of one's family, one must have recourse to begging; specially when one has no other means available. But when the man himself possesses some little wealth, he shall remain contented, and shall not crave for more, with a view to performing costlier sacrifices, or making richer presents, and so forth. Such is the sense of the verse.—(159)

VERSE CLX.

ALL THAT IS DEPENDENT ON OTHERS IS PAINFUL; ALL THAT IS DEPENDENT ON ONESELF IS PLEASING; HE SHALL KNOW THIS TO BE, IN SHORT, THE DEFINITION OF PLEASURE AND PAIN.—(160)

Bhāṣya.

This verse deprecates begging.

'*All that is dependent on others is painful*;'—to say nothing of attending at his gates, following in his wake, and wandering about here and there (all which is involved in the act of begging). It has been said that—'the very idea of begging, the heart cannot bear,—it is doubtless the greatest illusion; it is not a creation of the self-born Creator.'

'*In short*'—briefly. Pain is briefly defined as 'begging,' and Pleasure as 'absence of want'—(160)

VERSE CLXI.

HE SHALL PERFORM, WITH DILIGENCE THAT ACT, BY PERFORMING WHICH THERE ARISES SATISFACTION IN HIS INNER SOUL; AND HE SHALL AVOID THE CONTRARY.—(161)

Bhāṣya.

The 'soul's satisfaction', already mentioned before, is mentioned again for recalling it to the mind; and its exact scope has already been explained.

While an act is being performed, if there arises in the mind no sort of doubt or hesitation, then that act should be proceeded with. But, if the mind is not satisfied in regard to an action, that action should be avoided.—(161)

VERSE CLXII.

HE SHALL NOT INJURE HIS PRECEPTOR, OR TEACHER OR FATHER, OR MOTHER, OR ANOTHER ELDER, OR BRĀHMAṆAS, OR COWS, OR ANY PERSONS PERFORMING AUSTERITIES.—(162)

Bhāṣya.

'*Preceptor*'—who initiated him.

'*Teacher*'—who taught him, and explained to him (the Veda).

'*Elder*'—other than the aforesaid two; *i.e.*, the paternal uncle, the maternal uncle, and so forth.

'*Any persons performing austerities.*'—The term 'any' has been added with a view to include those sinners also who may be engaged in the performance of Expiatory Rites.

In various places, the injuring of *all* living beings has been forbidden : and some people think that the repetition of the same in the present text is meant to forbid the injuring of even such Preceptors and Teachers, etc., as may be great sinners and dangerous enemies; and that what is stated in 8.350 regarding the propriety of striking 'the teacher, or the boy, or the old man,' etc., is only a counter-exception to what is forbidden in the present verse.

Our Teacher, however, says as follows :—The present verse is not a 'prohibition,' it is of the nature of 'preclusion;' and it is meant to prescribe the determination (not to injure the persons), just like the text—'he shall not look

at the rising sun,' etc. Hence, the mere act of injury having already gone before, the present may be taken as forbidding even the *idea* of injuring the persons mentioned.

Or, the term '*himsā*,' 'injury,' may be taken to mean 'the saying of disagreeable words;' in view of such expressions as 'he *struck* her with words.'

Or, the root '*hanti*' (in 'himsa') may be taken as used in the sense of *acting against*.—(162).

VERSE CLIII.

HE SHALL AVOID ATHEISM, CAVILLING AT THE VEDAS, ABUSING OF THE GODS, HATRED, HAUGHTINESS, PRIDE, ANGER AND HASTINESS.—(163)

Bhāṣya.

'*Atheism*' consists in thinking, as untrue, of things that are spoken of in the Veda.

'*Cavilling*' is giving verbal expression to such ideas as—'the Veda is full of needless repetitions and self-contradictions,' 'there is nothing true in it,'—with an evil intent, and not merely by way of propounding a discussion on these points.

'*Gods*'—*i.e.*, Agni and the rest; the 'abusing' of these stands for 'talking ill of them.' *E.g.* people are found to make such assertions as—'we have been struck by the wretched gods.'

'*Hatred*'—ill-feeling aroused by jealousy, etc.

'*Haughtiness*'—want of humility, due to pride.

'*Pride*'—Vanity regarding oneself: 'I am very learned,' 'I am very rich,' and so forth.

'*Anger*'—wrath.

'*Harshness*'—cruelty; *i.e.*, anger preceded by hatred. (163)

VERSE CLXIV.

HE SHALL NOT, WHEN ANGRY, RAISE THE ROD AGAINST ANOTHER PERSON, NOR SHALL HE LET IT FALL; EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF THE SON OR THE PUPIL; THESE TWO HE MAY BEAT WITH A VIEW TO CORRECTION.—(164)

Bhāṣya.

'Daṇḍa,' 'rod,' is that whereby one *is struck,* '*daṇḍyatē;*' that is, the hand, the stick, the whip, the rope, the split-bamboo, and so forth.—This '*rod*' '*he shall not raise, when angry, against another person* ;' *i.e.*, he shall not hold it up ; nor shall he let it fall down ; *i.e.*, bring it into contact with the other person's body.

The son and the pupil one may strike with the whip, the split-bamboo, or the slap,—as is going to be mentioned under Discourse VIII,—but not with the *stick*. Further, these two are to be beaten, not in anger, but only *with a view to correction,*'—*i. e.*, for the purpose of correcting them, if through boyishness. they happen to misbehave. And these two are to be punished lightly, as is going to be laid down under 8·299.

The '*pupil*' is meant to exclude the male and female slaves also ; the purpose served (*i. e.*, correction) being the same in both cases—(164).

VERSE CLXV.

THE TWICE-BORN PERSON WHO THREATENS A BRĀHMAṆA, WITH THE INTENTION OF STRIKING HIM, WANDERS ABOUT IN THE TĀMISRA HELL FOR A HUNDRED YEARS.—(165)

Bhāṣya.

The striking of all persons having been equally forbidden, the next five verses are meant to show the greater heinousness of striking the Brāhmaṇa.

'*Threatens*'—by raising the stick—'*with the intention of striking*'—*i.e.*, beating,—even actually letting the stick fall.

'*For a hundred years he wanders about in hell,*' *i.e.*, continues to suffer the evil effects of that act.—(165).

VERSE CLXIV.

HAVING, IN ANGER, STRUCK HIM INTENTIONALLY, EVEN WITH A STRAW, HE IS BORN, DURING TWENTY-ONE BIRTHS, IN SINFUL WOMBS.—(166)

Bhāṣya.

'*In anger*'—*i.e.*, in a fit of wrath; not in joke; and '*intentionally*.'

'*Ājāti*' is *janma, birth*; the initial '*ā*' being meaningless; just as in the term, '*pralambate*, the initial '*pra*' is meaningless.

'*Sinful wombs*'—the wombs of sinful beings, *i.e.*, the lower animals, whose life is full of suffering.

To say nothing of more painful objects, by striking even by a straw, the man suffers the pangs of hell for a long time.—(166).

VERSE CLXVII.

THE MAN, WHO, THROUGH FOLLY, CAUSES BLOOD TO FLOW FROM THE BODY OF A BRĀHMAṆA WHO IS NOT FIGHTING, UNDERGOES, AFTER DEATH, VERY GREAT SUFFERING.—(167)

Bhāṣya.

'*Asṛk*' is blood;—he who causes this to flow from the body of the Brāhmaṇa, by the stroke of the sword or such other weapons,—'*even the Brāhmaṇa is not fighting*,'—and not when he is actually taking part in lawful battle, like Droṇāchārya.

'*Very great suffering*'—in the form of hell.

'*After death*,'—*i.e.*, in another birth.

'*Through folly*.'—This is a needless reiteration; the wise man, knowing the scriptures, can never do such a thing.—(167).

VERSE CLXVIII.

AS MANY PARTICLES OF DUST THE BLOOD TAKES UP FROM THE GROUND, DURING SO MANY YEARS IS THE BLOOD-SPILLER DEVOURED BY OTHERS IN THE OTHER WORLD.—(168)

Bhāṣya.

The result mentioned in the preceding verse accrues in the case of light hurt; when, however, the hurt is

serious,—'*as many particles of dust are taken up*'—coagulated—by the blood falling from the Brāhmaṇa's body, on the ground;—'*during so many years*'—'*in the other world*'—the '*blood-spiller*'—the man who struck—'*is devoured*' by dogs and jackals.—(168).

VERSE CLXIX.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE LEARNED MAN SHALL NEVER EVEN THREATEN A TWICE-BORN PERSON; HE SHALL NOT STRIKE HIM EVEN WITH A STRAW; AND HE SHALL NOT SPILL BLOOD FROM HIS BODY.—(169).

Bhāṣya.

This sums up the prohibition of the aforesaid three acts of raising the stick and letting it fall (and making blood flow).

'*Never*'—*i e.*, not even in abnormal times.—(169).

VERSE CLXX.

THE MAN WHO IS UNRIGHTEOUS, HE WHOSE WEALTH IS MIS-BEGOTTEN, AND HE WHO IS ALWAYS ADDICTED TO INJURING, NEVER OBTAINS HAPPINESS IN THIS WORLD.—(170)

Bhāṣya.

This is supplementry to the prohibition of Injury in general.

'*Unrighteousness*' consists in doing acts forbidden by the scriptures, such as incest, and the like; and the man who does such acts is '*unrighteous.*'

'*He whose wealth is mis-begotten,*'—*i.e.*, he who acquires wealth in the form of bribes offered for telling lies at legal proceedings, etc.

'*He who is addicted to injuring,*'—he who always seeks to injure others, either through enmity, or for fulfilling some other purpose.

Such a man does not obtain 'happiness in this world.—(170).

VERSE CLXXI.

PERCEIVING THE QUICK OVERTHROW OF UNRIGHTEOUS SINNERS, HE SHALL NOT TURN HIS MIND TOWARDS UNRIGHTEOUSNESS, EVEN THOUGH SUFFERING IN CONSEQUENCE OF RIGHTEONSNESS.—(171)

Bhāṣya

'*Dharma*,' 'Right,' consists in the bounds of propriety laid down in the scriptures;—one who acts according to this,—even though he may 'suffer' failure—'*shall not turn his mind towards unrighteousness*.' Because, even though unrighteous men may be found to have become rich by wealth acquired by bribery, hypocrisy, and the like,—yet very soon their '*overthrow*'—in the form of destruction of their wealth, etc.—is found to come about. Consequently, one should never deviate from the right.

The Author has, in a friendly spirit, shown us a visible instance.—(171)

VERSE CLXXII.

UNRIGHTEOUSNESS, PRACTISED IN THIS WORLD, DOES NOT, LIKE THE EARTH (OR THE COW) BRING ITS FRUIT IMMEDIATELY; BUT, ACCUMULATING GRADUALLY, IT CUTS OFF THE ROOTS OF THE PERPETRATOR.—(172)

Bhāṣya

The Author now proceeds to describe the sense of the scriptures.

What is said here is in view of the fact that the acts mentioned in the Vedas as leading to good and evil results, are uncertain in regard to the time of their fruition.

'*Unrighteousness, practised, does not bring its fruit immediately*.'

All that is mentioned in the Veda is that the acts prescribed bring good results, and those forbidden bring evil results; the exact time of fruition is not mentioned. Even though the verbal operation of the Vedic texts rests with indicating that a certain act *shall be done*, yet it ends in indicating the relation between an act and the results accru-

18

ing therefrom; but it does not say anything regarding the time of the fruition of the acts done, with a view to obtaining certain results; as for the obligatory acts, that they *shall be done* follows from their very nature;—lastly, in regard to the avoiding of the forbidden act also, the persons entitled to this are not only those who are desirous of avoiding the sufferings of hell, etc., but all those who are desirous of abiding by the scriptures. And what the scriptural prohibition does is to intimate that the doing of the forbidden act results in suffering. A full discussion of this subject will prolong our work to an undue length. Hence we stop here.

'*Gauriva*'—'like the Earth (or the Cow).'—The example cited here is meant to be both (*a*) 'similar' and (*b*) 'dissimilar.' (*a*) The Earth, on having the seed sown in it, does not immediately bring forth the sheaves of corn; in fact, it requires gradual development; similar is the case with the Vedic act; this is the similarity (between the *act* and the *Earth*). (*b*) Through dissimilarity also—the animal, *cow*, on being milked, brings its fruit (milk) immediately; *not so* Virtue and Vice.

Though the text mentions 'unrighteousness' only, yet what is meant is to show the uncertainty of time regarding the fruition of '*righteousness*' also.

'*Accumulating*'—gaining strength in time;—'*of the actor*'—of the perpetrator of the act—'*cuts off*'—destroys—'*the roots.*'

The *cutting off of the root* indicates total annihilation. Just as, when the roots are cut off, trees do not grow again; similarly, the practice of unrighteousness also.—(172)

VERSE CLXXIII.

IF NOT ON HIMSELF, THEN ON HIS SONS,—IF NOT ON HIS SONS, THEN ON HIS GRANDSONS (FALLS THE PUNISHMENT); AN UNRIGHTEOUSNESS, ONCE COMMITTED, NEVER FAILS TO BRING ITS CONSEQUENCES TO THE PERPETRATOR.—(173)

Bhāṣya.

"It is not right that the consequences of acts done by one person should be described as falling on others. As a matter of fact, all Vedic acts bring their fruits to the person who performs them. The principle of the *Vaishvānara* sacrifice (whereby the fruits of the sacrifice accrue to the son of the performer) cannot be held to be applicable to the present case, as there is no direct assertion to that effect. In connection with the acts dealt with in the present context, there is no assertion to the effect that their consequences accrue to the performer's son."

True; but when the son suffers pain, it causes the father still greater pain; so that, in that case also, the resultant suffering would fall upon the perpetrator himsef. As regards the son also, the said suffering may be said to come to him by virtue of some past misdeed of his son; and there would be nothing incongruous in this.

The same holds good regarding '*grandsons*' also.

'*Kṛto-dharmaḥ.*'—Whether the component words be read as '*Kṛtaḥ-dharmaḥ*' or '*Kṛtaḥ-adharmaḥ,*' the resultant conjunct form would be the same—'*Kṛto-dharmaḥ*;' hence both *dharma* (righteousness) and *adharma* (unrighteousness) are meant to be spoken of (as not failing in bringing up their consequences)—(173).

VERSE CLXXIV.

FOR A TIME ONE PROSPERS THROUGH UNRIGHTEOUSNESS, FOR A WHILE HE EXPERIENCES GOOD THINGS, AND FOR A TIME HE CONQUERS HIS ENEMIES; BUT, AFTER ALL, HE PERISHES ROOT AND BRANCH.—(174)

Bhāṣya.

'*Through unrighteousness,*'—such as causing injury to his master, and so forth—'*he prospers*'—gains advancement.

'*For a time,*'—for the time being only.

Then, '*for a while*'—after having gained riches and lands,—'*he experiences*'—enjoys—'*good things* ;'—*i. e.*, such signs of prosperity as the presence of many servants, the possession of cattle, horses, and so forth.

Then, '*he conquers his enemies*'—*i.e.*, ill-treats such persons as are poor. What are meant by 'enemies' are those persons who, remaining firm in the path of righteousness, do not have recourse to questionable means of livelihood ; and, in comparison to a rich person, the poverty of such men would involve a certain amount of *insult*.

Having remained thus for some time, such persons become destroyed '*root and branch*,' *i.e.*, along with their children, relations and riches.

For these reasons, righteousness should not be forsaken.—(174).

VERSE CLXXV.

HE SHALL ALWAYS DELIGHT IN TRUTHFULNESS, LAW AND RIGHT CONDUCT, AS ALSO IN CEANLINESS ; HE SHALL GOVERN HIS PUPILS IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW,—WITH HIS SPEECH ARMS, AND BELLY DULY CONTROLLED.—(175)

Bhāṣya.

'*Truthfulness*,'—the habit of saying things just as they are seen.

'*Law*,'—Injunctions and Prohibitions contained in the Veda.

Though Truthfulness also would be involved under 'law,' yet it has been mentioned separately, with a view to emphasize its special importance.

The fact of the matter is that 'untruthfulness' being the very nature of men, it is forbidden again and again with special emphasis.

'*Right conduct*,'—the conduct of good men. 'Good men' are those that are cultured; and the 'conduct' or course of action adopted by them.

In all these, '*he shall delight.*' 'Delight' is *satisfaction.* Hence, what the text enjoins is satisfaction with those just enumerated; the sense being that 'he should show satisfaction of mind at the sight of all right forms of activity.'

'*Pupils,*'—wife, son, slaves and students; these should be governed '*in accordance with law;*' the law being what has been laid down in this connection under 8. 299, *et seq.*

'*With his speech, arms and belly duly controlled.*'—Whether there be necessity or not, if one does not speak much, this is what is called 'control of speech.' The 'control of arms' consists in not causing pain to others by the strength of one's arms. The 'control of belly' consists in non-gluttony, not eating too much;—gluttony consisting in eating much at other people's houses, with special zest for a particular article of food.

What has been already said before, is repeated over and over again, because wholesome advice is to be given at all times. This is the explanation of all repetitions.—(175)

VERSE CLXXVI.

HE SHALL AVOID SUCH WEALTH AND PLEASURES AS ARE OPPOSED TO RIGHTEOUSNESS, AS ALSO RIGHTEOUSNESS IF IT BE CONDUCIVE TO UNHAPPINESS, OR DISAPPROVED BY THE PEOPLE.—(176)

Bhāṣya.

It has been said above that the 'group of three' constitutes the 'ends of man.' Some people might think that all the three are equally important, and argue as follows and act accordingly:—"Righteous acts, like the Jyotiṣṭoma, &c., are found to be performed at the cost of wealth and pleasure. Such acts lead to loss of wealth by the giving away of the sacrificial fee and other gifts; and they are opposed to pleasure, inasmach as it has been laid down that the person initiated for sacrifices shall remain continent, and so forth. Exactly in the same manner, it would be right to have

Bhāṣya.

The 'rightious path' that has been followed by his forefathers,— in the way of forming friendships with certain persons, the forming of marriage-alliances with certain people, the studying of a certain rescensional text of the Veda, and so forth ,—that same path should be followed by the man himself. By acting thus, he '*shall not suffer*'— *i.e.*, he does not suffer harm, is not blamed in the world.

What is here laid down is the means of knowing one's duty, that is open to ignorant men,—especially in regard to such acts as not injuring others, and so forth ; just like the beat of the royal drum, which announces to the Mlechchhas and other people what they should do. So far as the *Agnihotra* and such acts are concerned, these are to be learnt only by the texts bearing upon each of them.

Some people urge the following objection here :— "If what has been done by the forefathers happen to be such as has no basis in the scriptures,—how can that be regarded as '*dharma*,' a 'rightious act ?' If, on the other hand, it has some basis in the scriptures, then that same would be the source of knowledge open to the son also ; and in that case, what would be the point in referring him to the practice of his forefathers ?"

This objection we have already answered by pointing out that what is here laid down as the means of knowing duty that is open to illiterate persons.

Others, again, make the following assertion :—" In a case where, even on careful examination, one's doubt regarding one's duty does not cease,—and the texts available are capable of lending support to both the courses open to him ,— in such cases, one should act according to the practice of one's forefathers."

This view also needs to be examined. There is no *valid* source of knowledge that can be always doubtful ; the text

bearing upon a question must always point to only one efficient course of action.

It may be that what is meant is that, in the matter of optional alternatives, one should adopt the practice of one's forefathers; simply because it has been adopted by others in the past.

'*The path of the righteous.*'—This has been added with a view to emphasize the fact that, if one's forefathers may have followed an unrighteous path, one shall not follow such a practice, in such cases.—(178).

VERSES CLXIX AND CLXXX.

HE SHALL NOT HAVE A QUARREL WITH THE OFFICIATING PRIEST, THE PRIEST, OR HIS TEACHER, OR WITH HIS MATERNAL UNCLE, OR HIS GUESTS OR DEPENDANTS, WITH CHILDREN, OR WITH OLD OR SICK PERSONS, OR WITH DOCTORS, WITH HIS PATERNAL RELATIONS OR MARRIAGE RELATIONS, WITH HIS PARENTS, OR FEMALE RELATIONS, OR BROTHER OR SON, OR WIFE, OR DAUGHTER, OR WITH HIS SLAVES.—(179-180).

Bhāṣya.

'*He shall not have*'—is connected with each of the persons.

'*Dependants*'—who derive their livelihood from him.

'*Doctors*'—learned men, or physicians.

'*Jñāti*'—paternal relations.

'*Sambandhi*'—relations by marriage.

'*Bāndhava*'—maternal relations; sons of maternal aunt, and so forth.

'*Female relations*'—sisters and other married relations.

'*Quarrel*'—any sort of misunderstanding or unpleasant dealing, and even wordy quarrel—'*he shall not do*'—with any of these.—(180).

VERSE CLXXXI.

HAVING RENOUNCED QUARREL WITH THESE, THE HOUSEHOLDER BECOMES FREED FROM ALL SINS; AND, BY IGNORING THEM, HE WINS ALL THESE WORLDS.—(181)

Bhāṣya.

The sin that accrues from such quarelling, does not accrue to him who avoids them ;—this is what is meant by the phrase, '*becomes freed from all sins.*'

When these are ignored, he '*wins*'—makes his own—'*all these worlds.*'

This is a purely commendatory exaggeration.—(181).

VERSE CLXXXII.

THE TEACHER IS THE LORD OF THE WORLD OF BRAHMĀ ; THE FATHER IS SOVEREIGN OF THE WORLD OF PRAJĀPATI ; THE GUEST IS THE MASTER OF THE WORLD OF INDRA ; AND THE PRIESTS ARE THE LORDS OF THE WORLD OF GODS.—(182)

Bhāṣya.

The Teacher is the lord of Brahmā's world ; so that, when the Teacher is satisfied, that world is attained. It is this fact that is figuratively described as the Teacher being the lord of that region.

The Father is the sovereign of the world of Prajāpati.—(182).

VERSES CLXXXIII—CLXXXIV.

FEMALE RELATIVES (HAVE POWER) OVER THE REGION OF THE HEAVENLY NYMPHS ; MATERNAL RELATIONS, OVER THAT OF THE VISHVEDEVAS ; MARRIAGE-RELATIONS, OVER THE REGION OF THE WATERS ; THE MOTHER AND MATERNAL UNCLE, OVER THE EARTH ; THE CHILDREN, THE AGED, THE EMACIATED AND THE SICK SHOULD BE REGARDED AS THE LORDS OF ĀKĀSHA ; THE ELDER BROTHER IS EQUAL TO THE FATHER ; THE WIFE AND THE SON ARE ONE'S OWN BODY.—(183-184).

Bhāṣya.

'*The wife and the son are one's own*'— his very *own*—'*body.*'—(183-184)

VERSE CLXXXV.

SLAVES ARE ONE'S OWN SHADOW ; THE DAUGHTER IS THE HIGHEST OBJECT OF TENDERNESS. FOR THESE REASONS, WHEN OFFENDED BY THESE, HE SHALL ALWAYS BEAR IT WITHOUT HEAT.—(185)

Bhāṣya.

One's slaves are one's own shadow ; just as one's shadow always follows one, and is never an object of resentment, so also are one's slaves.

'*The daughter is the object of tenderness*'—*i.e.*, sympathy.

'*By these*'—aforesaid persons—'*when offended*'—attacked, made angry, by harsh words—'he shall bear it,'—'*asajavaraḥ*,' '*without heat*;'—this 'absence of heat' stands for the total absence of any disturbance of the mind or resentment; a man in feverish heat has his mind disturbed, so is also the man under resentment. Or, we may read '*asañjvaraḥ*,'—'*sañjvaraḥ*' being synonymous with 'santāpa,' 'heat' (according to *Amarakosha*) ; and this is prohibited by means of the negative prefix.—(185).

VERSE CLXXXVI.

THOUGH ENTITLED TO ACCEPT PRESENTS, HE SHALL AVOID ADDICTION TO IT ; BECAUSE, BY RECEIVING GIFTS, HIS SPIRITUAL LIGHT IS QUICKLY EXTINGUISHED.—(186).

Bhāṣya.

The 'gift' here meant is what one obtains from another person, who gives it with a view to some transcendental reward. Even though one may be '*entitled*'—*i.e.*, fit—to accept such a gift, one shall avoid getting into the habit of doing it again and again. The '*title*' or 'fitness' here meant consists in being endowed with an excellence of learning, study, and character, and possessing full knowledge of things and laws. Hence, what is stated in the second half of the verse is only the reiteration of what has been said above regarding the ignorant person fearing etc. (191)—(186).

VERSE CLXXXVII

WITHOUT KNOWING THE LAWFUL METHOD OF RECEIVING GIFTS, THE WISE MAN SHALL NOT ACCEPT ANY GIFTS ; EVEN THOUGH HE MAY BE PINING WITH HUNGER.—(187)

Bhāṣya.

'*Without knowing*, etc.'—One shall not accept gifts merely for the purpose of enjoying pleasures, etc. The meaning is that one shall accept gifts only for the maintaining of one's family, and for the due accomplishment of ones obligatory duties,—and for no other purpose.

'*Even though he may be pining with hunger*.'—That is, if, without accepting the gift, he should suffer emaciation; 'emaciation' standing for non-development of the body.

Or, we may construe the passage as '*dravyāṇām vidhim dharmyam pratigrahē*.—What is the '*dharmaya vidhi*,' 'the legal injunction?'—It would consist in the full knowledge of the purpose, the deity, the *mantra* and other details connected with the gift; such as—'Gold is given in honour of Agni, the cow in honour of Rudra,' and so forth.—(187)

VERSE CLXXXVIII.

THE ILLITERATE PERSON, ACCEPTING GOLD, LAND, HORSE, COW FOOD, CLOTHING, SESAMUM AND CLARIFIED BUTTER, BECOMES REDUCED TO ASHES, LIKE WOOD.—(188)

Bhāṣya.

The text states the evil results following from the illiterate man accepting the gift of certain specified things.—'He becomes reduced to ashes, like wood;'—just as wood, on being burnt by fire, becomes reduced to ashes, so the Brāhmaṇa, who is not endowed with proper learning, becomes reduced to ashes, by accepting the gift of gold and other things mentioned here.—(188).

VERSE CLXXXIX.

GOLD AND FOOD DESTROY LONGEVITY; LAND AND COW DESTROY THE BODY; THE HORSE DESTROYS THE EYE; CLOTHING DESTROYS THE SKIN; CLARIFIED BUTTER DESTROYS ENERGY; AND SESAMUM DESTROYS OFFSPRING.—(189)

Bhāṣya.

Land and Cow '*destroy*'—burn—'*the body.*'

In the case of the expression, '*hiraṇyam āyuḥ,*' the form of the verb '*oṣataḥ*' has to be changed into the singular form. Similar changes have to be made in connection with the other expressions—'*ashvaḥ chakṣuḥ,*' and the rest.—(189)

VERSE CLXXXX.

IF THE TWICE-BORN PERSON, WHO IS WITHOUT AUSTERITIES AND DOES NOT STUDY THE VEDA, SEEKS FOR GIFTS, HE SINKS ALONG WITH HIM INTO WATER; JUST LIKE ONE WHO SINKS ALONG WITH THE STONE-RAFT.—(190)

Bhāṣya.

He who has not performed any austerities and who does not study the Veda;—this 'studying' stands for the full knowledge of the Veda, which is what has been referred to in the text. Both these qualifications combined are necessary for entitling a man to receive gifts.

He who does not possess these two qualifications, and yet hankers after gifts, '*sinks along with him*;'—with whom?—Since no other person is mentioned, and the *giver* is the person mentioned in close proximity to the present context, it follows that it is along with the giver that the receiver sinks. The giver has recourse to the Recipient, for the purpose of crossing over (to heaven); if, therefore, the recipient happen to be unqualified, he makes both himself and the giver sink into water; just as the '*stone-raft,*'—the raft made of stone—does in water. '*Raft*' is that by which people cross rivers, such as boat and other things. One who gets on a piece of stone for crossing a river sinks into the water along with the stone-raft; in the same manner, the giver of gifts to the unqualified Brāhmaṇa, and the Brāhmaṇa receiving the gifts,—both go to hell.—(190).

VERSE CLXXXXI.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE ILLITERATE MAN SHOULD FIGHT SHY OF ACCEPTING EACH AND EVERY GIFT. BY RECEIVING EVEN A SMALL GIFT, THE ILLITERATE PERSON SINKS, LIKE THE COW IN A MORASS.—(191)

Bhāṣya.

For fear of hell, the '*illiterate*'—ignorant—'*person*' *should fight shy of accepting a gift*;'—*i.e.*, for fear of being destroyed, he should not accept any gifts;—to say nothing of *gold* and other specified things.

By accepting even '*a small gift*,' in the shape of things of little value as lead and the like, the illiterate man sinks in the same manner as the cow sinks in a morass.—(191).

VERSE CLXXXXII.

THE MAN KNOWING THE LAW, SHALL NOT OFFER EVEN WATER TO THE BRĀHMAṆA WHO BEHAVES LIKE A CAT; NOR TO THE WICKED BRĀHMAṆA WHO BEHAVES LIKE A HERON, NOR TO ONE IGNORANT OF THE VEDA.—(192)

Bhāṣya.

The duties of the Receiver having been described, the Text proceeds to describe those of the Giver.

The term, '*even*,' precludes the giving of all things; when even water is prohibited, how can anything else be given to the man? This is a hyperbolical way of forbidding the gift of other things. As for water itself, there can be no prohibition regarding it, as it is of use to all beings.

"It has been already said that one shall not honour, even with speech, those who behave like cats (4. 32)."

True; what is forbidden there, is the act of honouring them; what is forbidden here, is the offering of gifts to them; and these, the gifts of wealth, not of anything else. Thus, both prohibitions become useful, as is going to be asserted later on (193)—'Property, though earned according to law, etc.' It is for this reason that the giving of *food*, in a disrespectful manner, to heretics and others is not forbidden.

In this connection, some people argue as follows:—"Though the text has mentioned the person '*ignorant of the Veda*,' this should be taken to include also the person

who is not studying the Veda. Because all interested gifts have been laid down as to be offered to only such persons as are studying the Veda; and it is not right to put them on the same footing as heretics."

These persons should be asked the following question :— Where has it been laid down that gifts are to be offered to only such persons as are studying the Veda, and are still without full knowledge of it ?

It might be said that this has been laid down in 3.128, where it is said that—these things are to be given only to the *Shrotriya* (Vedic student).

But, since the same passage contains the qualification 'worthy'—and this is not possible without *complete learning*,—the passage cannot refer to the mere student still pursuing his studies. Specially, as we have such other passages as—'the fee shall be paid to a learned person'—which occur in the same context as the passage quoted. Hence, by taking the two passages together, it follows that gifts are to be offered to persons possessed of both the qualifications. Thus we do not find any ground for renouncing the direct meaning of the text.

As for the impropriety of the Vedic Student being put on the same footing as heretics,—there can be no impropriety in what is directly asserted by the text.

'*Vaiḍālavratika*' is one who behaves in the manner of a cat; and, similarly, '*vakavratika*' is one who has the manners of a heron.

The Locative endings have been used because it is the idea of *receptacle* that is meant to be conveyed. If the *recipient* were meant to be expressed, the Dative would have been the right form to use.—(192).

VERSE CLXXXXIII.

FOR PROPERTY, EVEN THOUGH ACQUIRED BY LAWFUL MEANS,—IF GIVEN TO THESE THREE PERSONS,—BRINGS CALAMITY, IN THE NEXT WORLD, TO THE GIVER, AS ALSO TO THE RECEIVER.—(193)

Bhāṣya.

The term ' property ' is meant to imply that the giving of *food* is not forbidden.

' *Though acquired by lawful means,* '—such as gifts from proper sources, by purchase and such other means as are permitted by the scriptures.

Such giving becomes a source of trouble to both the giver and the receiver in the next world.—(193).

VERSE CLXXXXIV.

JUST AS A MAN CROSSING WATER BY MEANS OF A STONE-RAFT SINKS DOWN, SO ALSO SINK DOWNWARDS THE IGNORANT GIVER AND RECEIVER.—(194)

Bhāṣya.

'*Aupala,*'—made of stone.

'*Raft,*'—boat and such other contrivances used in crossing water.

He who ' *crosses* '—proceeds to cross—water by such a raft, sinks down into the water. So also do ' *the ignorant giver and receiver.*'

The term, ' *pratichchhaka* ' is to be explained as '*pratichchhām karoti* ' (with the *ṇich* affix), and then the nominal ' *ṇvul* ' added to it.

' *Pratīpsakaḥ* ' is another reading ; this would be derived from the root '*āp,*' *to obtain*, with the derivative affix, and then the nominal '*ṇvul*' added to it. The meaning of both would be the same.—(194)

VERSE CLXXXXV.

HE WHO DISPLAYS HIS FLAG OF VIRTUE, IS EVER COVETOUS, A CHEAT AND A HYPOCRITE, INTENT ON DOING HARM, AND THE TRADUCER OF ALL PERSONS, IS TO BE KNOWN AS "ONE BEHAVING LIKE THE CAT."—(195)

Bhāṣya.

The two terms (' *viḍalavratika* ' and ' *vakavratika* ') are used figuratively, and the grounds of such figurative use being multifarious, that one is to be accepted, on

the basis whereof the term may have been used in a certain case. And it is necessary to ascertain this exactly, for the purpose of finding out definitely the exact import of the prohibition.

He for whom his virtue is *like a flag.* The compound is in accordance with Pāṇini 2. 1. 56. It may also be taken as a *Karmadhāraya* compound, the meaning being 'the virtuous flag.' The term, '*dharmadhvajī*' thus means, 'he who has flag-like virtue,' the word ending with the possessive affix '*ṇini.*' This name is applied to the man who performs righteous acts only for the purpose of fame, and not because they are prescribed in the scriptures, *i.e.*, the person who performs righteous acts only in such places where people see them, and who advertises his righteousness by his own agents, for the purpose of making himself known as righteous, and hence succeeding in receiving gifts, etc.

'*Covetous,*'—jealous and also miserly.

'*Hypocrite,*'—the man who commits fraud on the people.

'*Cheat,*'—he who behaves deceitfully. 'Cheating' is deceit. The person who is ostentatiously righteous, while in secret he steals what is guarded and makes known what should be kept secret, people think him to be a avirtuous man and, believing that a secret entrusted to him cannot leak out, convey to him some secret of theirs ; and in the end, this secret becomes divulged to just that person from whom it was intended to be kept. This is a form of injuring others.

'*The traducer of all persons,*'—he who cannot bear the good qualities of others, and hence calumniates them. '*Abhisandhaka*' is formed according to Pāṇini 3. 1. 136, and then the reflexive '*ka*' and '*sarvābhisandhaka*' is a Genitive Tatpuruaṣa compound.

Such a person is to be known as '*one who behaves like a cat*' a '*viḍalavratika.*'

At this place, some people read the following verse (in the text):—

VERSE CLXXXXVA.

When a man's flag of virtue is ever raised, like Indra's flag, and his sins are hidden,—this is the behaviour called "cat-like;" (195A)—and this states, in brief, what has been stated in the foregoing text (195).

The presence of even one of the qualities mentioned, marks out the man as one of cat-like behaviour; and that this is so is inferred from the verse just quoted. The clause, 'whose sins are hidden,' does not specifically mention any particular sin, and all the sins mentioned (in 195) are equally 'sins;' and thus, by means of these two verses, the same fact has been brought home to the pupils by the Teacher. Some of the pupils were taught the former verse (195) and some the present one (195A); both are equally authoritative. Thus then, when it is asserted that 'Devadatta is one who is wearing the armlet and the ear-ring, with fat shoulders and full chest,'—where all the qualifications are recognised as collectively distinguishing Devadatta,—yet, in the case in question, each of the qualifications serves singly to distinguish the man of 'cat-like behaviour.'—(195).

VERSE CLXXXXVI.

WITH EYES CAST DOWNWARDS, OF CRUEL DISPOSITION, INTENT UPON THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF HIS OWN ENDS, DISHONEST AND FALSELY HUMBLE;—SUCH IS THE BRĀHMAṆA 'WHO BEHAVES LIKE THE HERON'.—(196)

Bhāṣya.

'Looking downwards' is a mark of 'heron-like behaviour.' Or, the term, '*adhodṛiṣṭih*' may mean 'whose ideas are '*nīcha*,' *i.e.*, *mean*; he who is ever ready to do anything, who accepts gifts even from the lowest persons.

'*Niṣkṛti*' is cruelty; he, in whom this is the principal factor, is called '*niṣkṛtika*,' 'cruel,' he who talks in an improper manner.

'*Falsely humble*,'—who shows himself to be extremely gentle and harmless, but, in actual practice, turns out to be

most harmful. For example, the cat pretends to be asleep, when intent upon catching its prey ; similarly, the person whose righteousness is mingled with deceit, has been called '*a man of cat-like behaviour.*' So also with the expression, '*of heron-like behaviour* :' When seeking to catch fish, herons pretend to show as if they were taking no notice of the creatures in water, and yet all the time they are intent upon catching the fish.

The term '*vrata*' denotes *habit.*

It has been shown above how there is no repetition in the several parts of the verses. Even if there were some real repetitions, there would be nothing wrong in this, as the verses contain definitions (of two distinct characters) ; and the repeated assertions make the fact more easily intelligible.

"What is the difference between the *cat-like* and the *heron-like* behaviour?"

We explain as follows :—The latter (one who is *heron-like*) is bent upon accomplishing his own ends, he does not thwart the purposes of other men ; while the former (one who is *cat-like*), thwarts the purpose of other people, through sheer jealousy, even though his own interests be not served by it—(196).

VERSE CLXXXXVII.

THOSE BRĀHMAṆAS WHO ARE HERON-LIKE IN THEIR BEHAVIOUR, AND THOSE WHO ARE CAT-LIKE, FALL, BY THAT SINFUL ACT, INTO THE ANDHATĀMISRA HELL.—(197)

Bhāṣya.

This verse is explained by its own words.—(197).

VERSE CLXXXXVIII.

HAVING COMMITTED A SIN, HE SHALL NOT PERFORM PENANCE UNDER THE PRETEXT OF DOING A RIGHTEOUS ACT,—DECEIVING WOMEN AND SHŪDRAS BY THUS COVERING HIS SIN BY A PENANCE.—(198)

Bhāṣya.

'*Having committed a sin, he shall not perform a penance,*'—in the shape of an expiatory rite ;—'*under the pretext of doing a righteous act* ;'—pretending righteousness, he makes it known among people that he is doing the penance purely as a religious act, and that there has been no occasion for his doing it as an expiatory rite; though, in reality, he is doing it as an expiatory rite. This is what one should not do.

'*By covering sin,*'—by concealing his sin—one shall not—by means of the said righteous act—seek to deceive '*women and Shūdras.*'

The meaning is that, when one has to perform an expiatory rite, one shall openly perform it as such, except in the case of the Expiatory Rites distinctly laid down as 'secret'—(198).

VERSE CLXXXXIX.

SUCH BRĀHMAṆAS ARE CONDEMNED AFTER DEATH, AND ALSO HERE (IN THIS LIFE) BY THE EXPOUNDERS OF THE VEDA ; AND PENANCE DONE UNDER A FALSE PRETENCE GOES TO THE EVIL SPIRITS.—(199)

Bhāṣya.

The nature of things is such that, even though an act may be done with a view to a certain end, yet its other results also accrue to him. For instance, when one is intent upon obeying one's Teacher, it is with a view to the fulfilment of a religious duty, and not for obtaining pleasure ; and yet, from the very nature of the thing, the act of obedience brings pleasure.

Some people hold the following opinion :—"Penances serve the purpose of removing sins ; and even though performed with a view to other ends, they do not renounce their own nature. So that, in the case in question, the Expiatory Rite would serve both purposes,—I shall

become known by the people as *righteous*, and my sin also shall be removed."

It is with a view to setting aside such a view that the Author adds the present verse.

'*The penance done under a false pretence goes to evil spirits*;'—that is, it becomes useless, and it does not remove the sin.

It is not only that his purpose is not accomplished, in fact, such Brāhmaṇas—those performing penances under false pretences—'*are condemned*'—reprehended—'*by the expounders of the Veda*;' *i.e.*, by the cultured people, who know the authority of the Veda.—(199).

VERSE CC.

One who, though not entitled to the wearing of a certain badge, gains one's living by wearing that badge, takes off the sins of persons entitled to that badge, and is born in the womb of a lower animal.—(200)

Bhāṣya.

There is a distinctive badge connected with each of the life-stages. For the Student there is the wearing of the girdle-zone, etc.; for the Householder, there is the wearing of the bamboo-stick, the ear-ring, the water-pot, and so forth; and for the Wandering Recluse, the wearing of the reddish-brown garment, the rod, and so forth.

Now, if a Householder makes a living—by wearing one of of these badges, with a view to obtaining alms,—'*he takes off the sins of persons entitled to that badge*;'—helps them to become free from their debts; and '*is born in the womb of a lower animal*,' such as the jackal and the like.

In this connection, the difficulty should not be raised that it is not possible for the sins committed by the persons entitled to the badge to move away from them to go over to the pretender.

Because all that is meant by the text is that one should not wear the badge of other persons. Even though no direct prohibition is laid down, yet we deduce the said impropriety from the deprecatory statement contained in the verse.—(200)

VERSE CCI.

HE SHALL NEVER BATHE IN THE TANKS BELONGING TO OTHER PERSONS. HAVING BATHED THERE, HE BECOMES TAINTED WITH A PART OF THE TANK-DIGGER'S SIN.—(201)

Bhāṣya.

'*Nipāna*,'—which is etymologically explained as '*nipibanti asmin*,' or '*nipibanti asmāt*,'—'in which, or from which, people drink,'—means 'water-reservoir ;' that is, a tank, a well or a tank. And one should never bathe in any such tank as has been dug by another man for his own use, and has not been given away for the benefit of the public.

This forbids all kinds of bathing—(*a*) the obligatory daily bath, (*b*) the occasional bath necessitated by the touch of the Chāṇḍāla and such other persons, and (*c*) the ordinary bath taken for the relieving of heat and perspiration.

The text proceeds to point out the evil arising from the disobedience of the said prohibition :—he becomes '*tainted*'—contaminated—by a part of such sin as there may be of the person who dug the tank.

This is a deprecatory exaggeration, supplementing the preceding prohibition.—(201)

VERSE CCII.

BY USING ANOTHER PERSON'S CONVEYANCE, COUCH, SEAT, WELL, GARDEN OR HOUSE,—WHEN THESE HAVE NOT BEEN GIVEN,—ONE BECOMES THE PARTAKER OF THE FOURTH PART OF THAT PERSON'S SINS.—(202)

Bhāṣya.

If one uses the conveyance, etc., that belong to another person, and have not been given, one comes to partake of the fourth part of the sins of that person.

Some persons assert in this connection that, since the text uses the term '*when these have not been given*,' what is meant is that one should not use these things when they have been assigned for public use.

This is not right; because the prohibition herein contained refers to *what belongs to another person*; and what has been assigned for public use does not *belong to another person*; since he has already renounced his proprietory right over them, in the proper manner.

The specification of the '*fourth part*' is not meant to be emphasized; as has been already explained before.—(202)

VERSE CCIII.

He shall always bathe in rivers and in tanks and lakes dug by the gods; as also in water-holes and springs.—(203)

Bhāṣya.

As a matter of fact, all *rivers* are 'dug by the gods;' hence they cannot be both, which would necessitate the differentiation connoted by the epithet; hence the gender of the epithet should be that of the things qualified by it. As for *tanks*, etc., these are 'dug by gods' as well as 'dug by men. (Hence, in their case, the differentiation is necessary). As a matter of fact, these are never actually *dug by the gods*; all that is meant to be indicated by the epithet, therefore, is their *largeness* and *importance*, due to the fact that people do not remember who dug them.—(203)

VERSE CCIV.

The wise man shall always observe the Restraints, but not necessarily the Observances. Not observing the Restraints, and keeping the Observances alone, he falls.—(204)

Bhāṣya.

'*Yamas*,' 'Restraints,' are negative, of the nature of prohibitions; *e.g.*, 'the Brāhmaṇa should not be killed,' 'wine should not be drunk,' and so forth. The '*niyamas*,'

'*observances,*' are positive in form, of the nature of something *to be done* ; *e.g.*, 'one shall daily recite the Veda,' and so forth.

'*Not necessarily the Observances.*'—This does not mean that one shall not keep the Observances ; all that is meant is that the Restraints are more obligatory in their character than the Observances.

This is what is further emphasized :—'*Not observing the Restraints, one falls.*' If the Restraints are not observed, it means that Brāhmaṇa-killing and such acts are done, which means that the man has become an outcast, and people do not find it advisable to sit near him or have any dealings with him. It is not so in the case of the non-keeping of the Observances. To this effect we have the following assertions current among cultured people :—

'The man who keeps the Observances, but is not intent upon the Restraints, falls ; but he who observes the Restraints, but not the Observances, does not suffer. Therefore, one should devote one's attentions to the Restraints, not minding the Observances so much.'

For some people, the terms '*Yama*' and '*Niyama*' have technical significations,—*e.g.*, (*a*) 'not injuring others, truthfulness, continence, sinlessness, non-thieving,—these five constitute the *Yamas*, the major observances ; (*b*) Absence of Anger, Attendance on the Teacher, Purity, Light Food, Carefulness,—these constitute the five *Niyamas*, the minor Observances.'

Even according to this view, the present verse indicates the relative importance of the two sets of duties.

Thus, what the present verse lays down is neither that one shall observe the *Yamas*, nor that one shall *not* keep the Observances ; since both are equally prescribed by the scriptures.—(204)

VERSE CCV.

THE BRĀHMAṆA SHALL NEVER EAT AT A SACRIFICE PERFORMED BY ONE WHO HAS NOT LEARNT THE VEDA; OR AT ONE PERFORMED BY A VILLAGE-PRIEST, OR AT ONE OFFERED BY A WOMAN OR A EUNUCH.—(205).

Bhāṣya.

The preceding verse has closed the section on Positive Duties; now begins the section on prohibitions (Negative Duties).

Among the various acts it is that of eating which is likely to be done at random,—food being what is sought after most; hence the text proceeds with prohibitions regarding the act of eating.

'*Ashrotriya*,' '*Non-shrotriya*,' is *one who has not learnt the Veda*; at the sacrifice '*performed*'—undertaken—by him,—or at sacrifice at which the officiating priests are ignorant of the Veda—'*the Brāhmaṇa shall not eat.*'

'*Village-priest*,'—one who officiates as the priest of the entire village; where such a person, or a woman, offers the sacrifice.

In the *Chhāndogya*, the authors of the *Gṛhya*-rules have described the performance of sacrifices by women, and it is in view of this that the text forbids eating at such sacrifices. Or, the prohibition may refer to that sacrifice at which the woman is the principal performer; her husband being beset with poverty and other disqualifications, and the woman being proud of the wealth acquired by her as dowry, or of the wealth possessed by her relations.

'*Eunuch*'—wanting in masculinity.—(205)

VERSE CCVI.

WHERE SUCH PERSONS POUR THE OBLATIONS, IT IS CONSIDERED INDECENT BY ALL GOOD MEN; IT IS DISAGREEABLE TO THE GODS; HENCE, ONE SHOULD AVOID IT.—(206)

Bhāṣya.

This verse is supplementary to the foregoing prohibitive Injunction.

'*Indecent*'—blameworthy.

'*By good men*'—by all cultured people.

'*Where such persons pour the oblations,*'—*i.e.*, offer sacrifices.

'*It is disagreeable*'—displeasing—'to the gods.'

'*Hence one should avoid*'—going to—'these sacrifices.'—(206).

VERSE CCVII.

HE SHALL NEVER EAT FOOD OFFERED BY INTOXICATED OR ANGRY OR SICK PERSONS; NOR THAT WHICH IS CONTAMINATED BY HAIR OR INSECTS, OR THAT WHICH HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY TOUCHED WITH THE FOOT.—(207)

Bhāṣya.

The food offered by such persons is to be avoided, so long as the intoxication and other conditions are actually on them.

Others explain the text to refer to habit; the sense being that one should avoid the food offered by such persons as are frequently drunk,—who are habitual drunkards.

Similarly, with one who has bad temper and is frequently obssessed by rage; or one who is mostly sick, a confirmed invalid.

'*What is contaminated by*'—spoilt by the touch of—'*hair and insect.*' Among insects, there are some which contaminate the food by their presence when they are dead; *e.g.*, flies and lizards; while others spoil it even when living.

The term '*insect*' includes all small creatures, such as worms, flies, etc. And '*hair*' includes nails and bristles, as also dirt and other things;—on the basis of usage.

'*What is touched with the foot intentionally*;'—there is no harm if it is touched simply through chance carelessness—(207).

VERSE CCVIII.

NOR THAT WHICH HAS BEEN LOOKED AT BY THE BRĀHMAṆA-SLAYER, OR WHAT HAS BEEN TOUCHED BY A WOMAN IN HER COURSES, OR WHAT HAS BEEN PECKED BY THE BIRDS, OR WHAT HAS BEEN TOUCHED BY A DOG.—(208)

Bhāṣya.

'*Bhrūṇahā*' is the *Brāhmaṇa-slayer*; what has been '*looked at*'—eagerly seen—by such a person. This is only illustrative; it indicates other sinful persons also. The prohibition of food *touched* by these persons follows from the rule that lays down the necessity of bathing on being touched by such sinners.

'*Udakyā*' is the woman in her courses; and what is forbidden is food *touched*—not merely *seen*—by her.

"As a matter of fact, the Text is going to lay down the necessity of bathing on touching a woman in her courses; this alone being sufficient to indicate her impurity, how could there be any possibility of any one taking the food touched by her (that the Author should have found it necessary to forbid it)?"

Our answer to this is as follows:—[This prohibition was thought necessary, because] in the first place, people might be led to eat food touched by her after having washed it; or secondly, in view of what has been said regarding the mention of the '*Brāhmaṇa-slayer*' being illustrative, some one might be led to believe that this latter term is indicative of all those that are mentioned in verse 5. 85; and, in that case, the prohibition would apply to the food even *seen* by the woman in her courses.

This same explanation applies to the prohibition of '*what has been touched by a dog.*'

It has been said that the term '*Brāhmaṇa-slayer*' is indicative of other sinful outcasts also; and what are thus included are the 'outcast,' 'the newly-delivered woman' and others mentioned later on (in 5. 85); and the 'woman in her courses' also includes the newly-delivered woman.

'*Patatri*' is bird; and the birds meant are the carnivorous ones, the vulture, *etc.*, and not the swan and other non-carnivorous ones; such being the usage among men.—(208)

VERSE CCIX.

NOR THE FOOD THAT HAS BEEN SMELT BY THE COW, NOR PARTICULARLY THAT FOOD WHICH HAS BEEN PUBLICLY OFFERED, NOR THE FOOD THAT BELONGS TO A MULTITUDE, NOR THE FOOD OF THE HARLOT, NOR THAT WHICH HAS BEEN CENSURED BY THE LEARNED.—(209)

Bhāṣya.

'*Food publicly offered,*'—the food that is given at temples or sacrificial sessions, by public notice, to all comers, without any invitation to individuals. Or, it may mean 'what is given to one person after having been promised to another.'

The root, '*Ghuṣ*' has been declared to mean *to announce*; so that people regard the present verse as refering to cases where there is no announcement; and what is forbidden, therefore, is eating, *without invitation*, at sacrifices, marriages and such other functions.

The '*gaṇa*,' meant by the text is *multitude, company*; hence the name is not applied to a number of brothers living together undivided. It is declared in Discourse IX that 'there is a single duty operating among brothers living jointly'; and the duty therein referred to is the *receiving of guests*, and so forth; all which is made clear under 9. 105, where the 'eldest brother' is declared as inheriting the entire parental property; and it is this inheritance that indicates his liability to fulfil the duties also.

What is forbidden is what is not included in the parental heritage, even though it belong in common to all.

'*Harlot*' is the public woman.

'*Censured*'—deprecated,—'*by the learned*',—even though it be something edible; *e.g.*, the lotus-stalk, the oil-cake, and so forth.—(209)

VERSE CCX.

NOR THE FOOD OF THE THIEF OR THE SINGER, NOR OF THE CARPENTER, THE USURER, OF THE INITIATED PERSON, OF THE MISER, THE PRISONER AND THE FETTERED.—(210)

Bhāṣya.

'*Singer*,'—Who lives by singing. The ordinary occasional singing of popular songs is actually laid down.

'*Miser*'—niggard.

The difference between the 'prisoner' and the 'fettered' is, that the former may be imprisoned by mere words (verbal orders), while the latter is actually bound in ropes and iron-chains.

Some people read '*vishadasya*' for '*nigadasya*;'—'*vishada*' being explained as 'man in trouble.'—(210)

VERSE CCXI.

NOR THE FOOD OF AN ACCUSED PERSON, OR OF THE HERMAPHRODITE, OR THE UNCHASTE WOMAN, OR THE HYPOCRITE; NOR THE FOOD TURNED SOUR, OR THAT KEPT OVERNIGHT, OR WHAT FORMS THE LEAVINGS OF THE SHŪDRA.—(211)

Bhāṣya.

'*Unchaste woman*'—one who has sexual intercourse with any and every person.

"The food of the harlot has been already forbidden [so that the present text would appear to be superfluous]."

It is not so; the 'unchaste woman' is totally different from the 'harlot.' The 'harlot' is one that makes a living by her beauty; while the 'unchaste woman' is one who is unstable in her sexual passions.

'*Hypocrite*,'—the 'man of cat-like behaviour' and others of similar bad conduct.

'*The Shūdra's leavings*' are specially forbidden here for the purpose of indicating the heaviness of the expiatory panance necessitated by it;—the partaking of the leavings of all men having been already forbidden.

Others explain the terms, '*Shūdra's leavings,*' to mean the food *left in the dish*, after the *Shūdra* has eaten out of it.

Another reading is '*uchchhiṣṭamagurostathā*,' 'the leavings of persons other than one's teacher.'

As a matter of fact, the term '*uchchhiṣṭa*' stands for that which has been defiled by the touch of another person, as also for that which has been left after another person has eaten. In the latter sense, if one's own 'leavings' were prohibited, then every one would have to eat the whole of one's food as a single morsel. Nor is it the custom among cultured people that, after having eaten one morsel of food, the man washes his hands and mouth and eats the next morsel out of another dish. As for the prohibition that 'one should not eat the food once partaken of,' what this forbids is the interruption of the meal by such acts as rising to receive a guest, and so forth, till one has had one's fill and till one has washed; after which the touch of others involves no harm.

Where several persons are dining together, even if they happen to touch one another,—as this touching is something totally different,—it would not be a case of 'eating the leavings.' As a matter of fact, the Father, along with his sons, always partakes of the food *left* by guests. Āpastamba and others have deprecated eating *with uninitiated sons*,—not with the *initiated* ones.

According to this view, the prohibition would apply to eating in the company of men of other castes; and, in all such cases, some intervening screen shall be set up between the two persons. As for 'leavings,' in the sense of what has been left after one has eaten,—this is forbidden, whether

it be one's own 'leavings' or those of some other person,—(211).

VERSE CCXII.

NOR THE FOOD OF THE PHYSICIAN, OR OF THE HUNTER, OR OF A CRUEL PERSON, OR OF ONE WHO LIVES ON LEAVINGS; NOR THE FOOD OF THE "UGRA;" NOR WHAT HAS BEEN COOKED FOR THE NEWLY-DELIVERED WOMAN, UNTIL TEN DAYS HAVE PASSED; NOR THAT WHICH HAS BEEN INTERRUPTED BY WASHING.—(212)

Bhāṣya.

'*Hunter*,'—the professional hunter of animals; one who kills animals for purposes of hunting, or for the purpose of selling their flesh.

'*Cruel*,'—whose nature is not straightforward, who is difficult to please.

'*One who lives on leavings*,'—*i.e.*, one who eats such leavings as have been forbidden.

'*Ugra*'—is the name of a special sub-caste. In the Veda, the term is applied to a kind of king, one who forms the central link in the chain of the king's alliance. There is no other prohibition regarding such a king; it is only in course of showing the evils arising from eating the food of such kings that we read—'the food given by kings deprives one of one's energy,' from which some sort of prohibition may be inferred. [For all these reasons, the term '*Ugra*' in the text must be taken to stand for a particular mixed caste, and not for the *king*].

'*Sūtikānnam*' is food prepared for the woman in child-bed; and this should not be eaten even by men of her own family.

This food is to be avoided '*until ten days have passed.*' Though, in the case of the Kṣattriya and other castes, the period of impurity lasts longer than ten days, yet the food is to be avoided for ten days only.

Another reading is '*sūtakānnam* ;' and the term '*sūtaka*,' 'impurity,' due to child-birth, in this case, would indicate the *persons* under that impurity ; the meaning being that 'one should not eat for ten days the food offered by persons, in whose family there is impurity due to child-birth.' This prohibition applies to those cases in which, for all persons, the period of impurity due to child-birth extends over ten days. But if the view be taken that impurity due to child-birth applies to the parents only, or to the mother only,—then food is to be avoided as long as the period of impurity may last in each particular case ;—the term '*until ten days have passed*' being indicative of the 'period of impurity.' Thus *Kṣattriyas* and others would have their food avoided during such time as the period of impurity may last in each individual case.

'*Sūtikānnamanirdasham*' being the right form of the expression, the term '*paryāchāntam*,' '*that which has been interrupted by washing*,' has been made to intervene (between the words, '*sūtikānnam*' and '*anirdasham*') by considerations of metrical exegencies.

Others have taken '*anirdasham*' separately, by itself (and not as qualifying '*sūtakānnam*'). Under this, the term '*sūtaka*' would indicate the period of impurity, and '*anirdasham*' would stand for the milk of the cow and other animals (within ten days of their calving).

'*Interrupted by washing*,'—in course of which rinsing and washing have been done. If, for some reason, the person washes his hand, then he should not eat of the food left in the dish.—(212)

VERSE CCXIII.

NOR WHAT IS OFFERED WITHOUT RESPECT, NOR IMPROPER MEAT, NOR FOOD BELONGING TO A MALE-LESS FEMALE, NOR THE FOOD OF AN ENEMY, NOR THE FOOD OF THE CITY-LORD, NOR THE FOOD OF AN OUTCAST, NOR THAT WHICH HAS BEEN SNEEZED AT.—(213)

Bhāṣya.

'*Offered without respect,*'—that which is given in a disrespectful manner, to a person who deserves to be treated with respect. This does not refer to food that may be offered by friends and others.

'*Improper meat,*'—which has been cooked for one's own self, and is not the remnant of the worship of gods.

'*Maleless female,*'—one who has neither husband nor son.

'*Enemy,*'—an adversary.

'*City-lord,*'—one who is the master of a city, though not a king.

'*Which has been sneezed at,*'—over which some one has sneezed.—(213)

VERSE CCXIV.

NOR THE FOOD OF THE INFORMER AND THE PERJURER, OR OF THE SELLER OF SACRIFICES; NOR THE FOOD OF THE ACTOR OR THE TAILOR; NOR THE FOOD OF THE UNGRATEFUL PERSON.—(214)

Bhāṣya.

'*Informer,*'—one who betrays the confidence reposed in him; or one who talks ill of persons behind their back.

'*Perjurer,*'—who has given false evidence.

'*Seller of sacrifices,*'—who, having performed a sacrifice, sells its fruit; *i.e.*, says to another person,—'May the fruit of this sacrifice be yours,' and receives a price for it. Though, in reality, there can be no 'selling' of a sacrifice, yet, what is forbidden, is the food of a person who makes such living, or who undertakes sacrifice with a view to cheat others.

'*Shailūṣa*'—is actor; or, according to others, he who exposes his wife for the public. Another *Smṛti* is more specific—'he who lives by dancing.'

'*Tailor*'—He who works with the needle.

'*Ungrateful person*,'—he who nullifies the good that has been done to him ; on the contrary, proceeds to do harm to his helper, and not to do a good turn to him, even though capable of doing so.—(214)

VERSE CCXV.

'NOR OF THE BLACKSMITH, OF THE NIṢĀDA, OF THE STAGE-PLAYER, OF THE GOLDSMITH, OF THE PLAYER OF MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS, OR OF THE DEALER IN WEAPONS,—(215).'

Bhāṣya.

'*Karmakāra*'—the blacksmith.

'*Niṣāda*,'—going to be described under Discourse X (as the son of a Brāhmaṇa from a *Shūdra* wife).

'*Stage-player*,'—the wrestler and such other persons, apart from the dancer and the singer (who have been separately mentioned) ;—or the curious person who visits every kind of stage.

'*Vēṇa*,'—one who lives by playing on musical instruments.

'*Dealer in weapons*,'—who sells either wrought iron weapons, as the sword and the like, or unwrought iron.—(215)

VERSE CCXVI.

NOR OF DOG-KEEPERS, OR OF WINE-SELLERS OR OF THE CLOTHES-WASHER, OR OF THE DYER, OR OF THE BARD, OR OF THE MAN IN WHOSE HOUSE THERE IS A PARAMOUR.—(216)

Bhāṣya.

Those who keep dogs for hunting purposes are called '*dog-keepers*.'

'*Wine-sellers*,'—those who deal in wines ; or those who make a living in wine-shops.

'*Clothes-washer*,'—he who washes and cleans clothes ; another name for them is '*Kāruka*.'

'*Dyer*'—one who dyes clothes in blue and other colours.

'*Nṛshamsa*'—is one who sings the praises of men, known as the '*bandī*,' '*bard*.' Or, it may stand for the *pitiless man*.

He in whose house there lives the paramour of his wife.—(216)

VERSE CCXVII.

NOR OF THOSE WHO BEAR THE PRESENCE OF THE PARAMOUR, OR OF THOSE WHO ARE ENTIRELY RULED BY WOMEN; NOR THE FOOD OF THOSE IN WHOSE HOUSE DEATH HAS OCCURRED AND THE TEN DAYS HAVE NOT PASSED; NOR THAT WHICH IS DISAGREEABLE.—(217)

Bhāṣya.

The man mentioned in the preceding verse is one who does not know of the presence of his wife's paramour; while the one mentioned here is one who knows it, and suffers it, and does not check his wife. If the man does not know of the presence of the paramour, who comes from another house, then the food given by such a man is not forbidden.

'*Who are ruled by women*,'—those persons in whose house the wife is the sole mistress and dispenser; and who are not master of themselves or of their dependants; who are entirely under the control of their wives.

'*Prētānnam*;'—when one is impure on account of death in his house, the food belonging to the members of his family is forbidden.—'*Ten days have not passed*;'—this indicates the period of time.

If the term, '*anirdasham*' (of verse 212), is to be taken by itself, as forbidding the food belonging to 'impure' persons, then 'the food belonging to persons in whose house there has been death' being already included there, the present term would stand for the food of those persons who are directly connected with the impurity; such persons, for instance, as the friends and maternal relations of the dead. Similarly, one shall not eat the food belonging to one who may be engaged in the performance of such rites as the

'*Chaturthī-Shrāddha*,' and the like, which is undertaken through sympathy with the person in whose house the death has occurred. Such *shrāddhas* have been mentioned by the Authors of *Gṛhyasūtras*, as also in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, in such passages as—'The *tenth-day Shrāddha*, the *Ninth-day Shrāddha*, the *Eighth-day Shrāddha*, the *Fourth-day Shrāddha*, etc.

'*What is disagreeable*;'—by eating which one does not feel happy.—(217)

VERSE CCXVIII.

THE KING'S FOOD TAKES OFF ONE'S VIGOUR AND THE SHŪDRA'S FOOD HIS BRAHMIC GLORY ; THE GOLDSMITH'S FOOD HIS LONGEVITY, AND THE LEATHER-CUTTER'S FOOD HIS FAME.—(218)

Bhāṣya.

The Text now proceeds to describe the effects of transgressing the above prohibitions.

One who eats the king's food loses his vigour ; and so with all the rest.

The terms 'goldsmith' and the rest, are denotative of particular *professions* ; so that those persons who deal in making articles of gold are called goldsmiths. Similarly, with 'dyer' and other terms. Those who cut leather are called 'leather-cutters,' this name being applied to those who live by this trade.

In the present context, there are some whose food has not been forbidden in the foregoing verses ; but the evil results flowing therefrom are now described ; the prohibition of these is to be inferred from the latter.—(218)

VERSE CCXIX.

THE FOOD OF ARTISANS IMPAIRS THE OFFSPRING, THAT OF THE CLOTHES-WASHER IMPAIRS STRENGTH ; THE FOOD OF A MULTITUDE AND THE FOOD OF THE HARLOT CUT OFF THE MAN FROM THE REGIONS.—(219)

Bhāṣya.

'*Artisans*,'—the professional cook and others following not very low crafts;—this is what distinguishes these from other craftsmen.

The '*impairing*' of offspring means that children are not born.—(219)

VERSE CCXX.

THE FOOD OF THE PHYSICIAN IS PUS; THE FOOD OF THE UNCHASTE WOMAN IS SEMEN; THE FOOD OF THE USURER IS ORDURE, AND THAT OF THE DEALER IN WEAPONS IS DIRT.—(220.)

Bhāṣya.

The physician's food is *like* pus.

'*Indriya*' means *semen*.

'*Ordure*' and '*dirt*' are one and the same.—(220)

VERSE CCXXI.

THE FOOD OF THOSE OTHER PERSONS WHO HAVE BEEN SUCCESSIVELY MENTIONED AS THOSE WHOSE FOOD SHOULD NOT BE EATEN,—THE WISE MEN DESCRIBE AS SKIN, BONES AND HAIRS.—(221)

Bhāṣya.

There are other persons who have been mentioned in this section as those whose food should not be eaten; and the food of these men is '*skin, bones* and *hairs*.' That is, the eating of their food is as improper as the eating of their skin, *etc.*—(221)

VERSE CCXXII.

AFTER UNKNOWINGLY EATING THE FOOD OF ANY ONE OF THESE, THERE SHOULD BE A THREE DAYS' FAST. HAVING EATEN IT KNOWINGLY, AS ALSO ON EATING SEMEN, ORDURE AND URINE, ONE SHOULD PERFORM THE "KṚCHCHHRA" PENANCE.—(222)

Bhāṣya.

'*Three days fast*;'—*i.e.*, he shall not eat anything for three days.

'*Unknowingly*,'—not intentionally.

In the case of its being done *intentionally*, one should perform the '*Kṛchchhra*' penance. And this '*Kṛchchhra*' should be the '*Tapta-kṛchchhra*,' in view of what other Smṛti texts have laid down. One such text (Gautama 23.2) has prescribed the '*Tapta-kṛchchhra*' as to be performed in the case of eating semen, ordure and urine ;—*viz.*, 'In the event of drinking these intentionally, one shall live upon milk, butter, water and air—upon each of these for three days ; this is the *Taptātikṛchchhra* ; and then follows his purification.'

The present being not a section dealing with Expiatory Rites, the mention of such a rite is meant to indicate the seriousness of the offence.

In view of the phrase, '*of any one of these*,' being in the Genitive form, some people have held that the Expiatory Rite here prescribed is meant to apply to only those cases where the food actually belongs to the persons mentioned, and *not* where it is objectionable by reason of time, or by its very nature, or by contact. Among such articles of food as sour-gruel and the like, non-eatability is of four kinds :—(1) some things are non-eatable, because of time ; *e.g.*, sour-gruel, things kept overnight, and so forth ; (2) some are non-eatable, because of contact ; *e.g.*, things that have come in contact with wine and such things ; (3) some are non-eatble by their very nature ; *e.g.*, garlic and such things ; (4) some are non-eatable by reason of their owner ; *e.g.*, the food of the persons enumerated in the present context.

Our answer to the above is as follows :—It is quite true that there are four kinds of *non-eatability* ; it is true also that the text has used the Genitive form ; but if the Expiatory Rite here prescribed did not pertain to such food as *sour gruel* and the like, but only to what is objectionable in regard to its owner, then the mention of these in the present

connection would be entirely meaningless. For the prohibition of these two things is coming under Discourse V. From this it is clear that their mention in the present context is only for the purpose of prescribing the Expiatory Rite.

"Why, then, should they be mentioned in Discourse V.?"

This we shall explain at that place. As for the exact meaning and purpose of such texts as—(*a*) 'the eating of the first two is objectionable' and (*b*) 'having eaten the food of persons whose food should not be eaten,' *etc.* (11. 152),—we shall explain all this in detail under those same texts—(222).

VERSE CCXXIII.

THE LEARNED BRĀHMAṆA SHALL NOT EAT THE COOKED FOOD OF THE SHŪDRA WHO PERFORMS NO SHRĀDDHAS. IN THE ABSENCE OF LIVELIHOOD, HE MAY RECEIVE FROM HIM RAW GRAIN SUFFICIENT FOR ONE DAY.—(223)

Bhāṣya.

Shūdra's food has been forbidden generally; and particular details regarding it are now laid down—'*who does not perform Shrāddhas.*

"Where has Shūdra's food been forbidden?"

It has been forbidden in 4. 211.

"What is forbidden there is Shūdra's *leavings*, and not other kinds of food."

Not so; the said verse (211) is to be construed as—'the Shūdra's food should not be eaten, *nor the leavings of others.*' The explanation that we gave above of this verse, was in accordance with the older Commentators; as we clearly pointed out there.

'*Who does not perform Shrāddhas.*'—'*Shrāddha*' here stands for the *sacrificing of cooked food* and such other rites as have been prescribed for the Shūdra; hence, the meaning is 'who does nor perform these rites.' What is meant

is that 'one shall not eat the cooked food of any *Shūdra*, except those of the better class.'

Another reading is '*ashraddhinaḥ*' (for '*ashrāddhinaḥ*) ; which means, 'who is devoid of faith ;' in the next verse also we find special stress laid down upon 'faith,' by the term '*vadānya*,' 'liberal.'

'*Raw*'—dry ; paddy, rice, and so forth.

'*Sufficient for one day*'—just that quantity which may suffice for one day,—not more.—(223)

VERSE CCXXIV.

THE GODS HAVING COMPARED THE FOOD OF THE MISERLY VEDIC SCHOLAR AND THAT OF THE LIBERAL USURER, ORDAINED THE FOOD OF BOTH TO BE EQUAL.—(224)

Bhāṣya.

What is meant is the Brāhmaṇa endowed with all necessary qualifications,—the term 'Vedic Scholar' being meant to be purely illustrative. '*Vedic Scholar*' means the learned man who performs all the duties that have been laid down for him. If such a person happens to be '*miserly*'—who does not take delight in receiving friends, relations and guests, and who does not wish to give anything to any person.

The other person is the '*usurer*,' living on usury, and thus engaged in objectional business. If he happens to be '*liberal*,' noble-minded, endowed with faith, is delighted at the arrival of people at his house, and duly honors them with food and other things.

The food belonging to these two persons the gods have ordained to be '*equal*.'

Even though one of them (the former) is possessed of all good qualities, yet he is condemned by reason of his niggardliness. It has been declared that 'covetousness spoils all good qualities.' The other person, even though endowed with due faith, is censured by reason of his objectionable business. Hence, '*having examined*'—duly pondered over

the matter—the gods have ordained that the food belonging to the two persons stands on the same footing.—(224)

VERSE CCXXV.

THEREUPON PRAJĀPATI CAME TO THEM AND SAID—"DO NOT MAKE THE UNEQUAL EQUAL: WHAT BELONGS TO THE LIBERAL MAN IS PURIFIED BY FAITH, WHILE THE OTHER IS DEFILED BY WANT OF FAITH.—(225)

Bhāṣya.

Prajāpati, having approached, said to the gods—'*Do not in this way, make the unequal equal*'—*i.e.*, do not establish any such improper equalisation.

Then the gods asked—'Who there is, then, the superior between the two persons?'

Then Prajāpati answered—'The food that belongs to the liberal-minded usurer, who is endowed with faith, is purified by faith, while the other food, that belongs to the Vedic scholar, is censured, condemned, by his act (faithlessness).'

This dialogue between Prajāpati and the gods is purely imaginary; all that is meant is that 'one shall not eat food offered by a person, who, though otherwise qualified, is devoid of faith, while that belonging to the *Shūdra* shall be eaten, if it is offered with due respect.'—(225)

VERSE CCXXVI.

HE SHALL ALWAYS DILIGENTY PERFORM, WITH FAITH, SACRIFICES AND OTHER RELIGIOUS ACTS; DONE WITH FAITH, AND WITH WELL-BEGOTTEN WEALTH, THEY BECOME IMPERISHABLE.—(226)

Bhāṣya.

'*Iṣṭa*,' '*sacrifice*,' stands for those acts of Sacrifice and the like that are done on a regular altar; while '*pūrta*' stands for other acts done with a view to spiritual results, such as honouring those who deserve to be honoured, and so forth.

Both these sets of acts shall be done '*with faith*;' and *with well-gotten wealth*;'—*i.e.*, with wealth got by such fair means as learning, bravery, bride, and so forth.

'Thus performed, these acts lead to imperishable results. Those that are performed with wealth not well-gotten, are not fruitless; they only lead to perishable (transitory) results. Because, even unfair means produce *ownership;* so that sacrifices may be performed with wealth over which one's ownership has been produced. Further, *usury* (as a means of acquiring wealth) is not found to have been prohibited anywhere in connection with sacrifices and charities. Hence it follows that, even with the help of such wealth, sacrifices, etc., shall be performed till Heaven has been attained. There will certainly be some difference in the degree of excellence in the results obtained.

Now, the question arises—What are the *fair* sources of acquiring wealth ?

In answer to this, we have the following verses :—

I. *What is derived from (a) learning, (b) bravery, (c) austerities, (d) bride, (e) person sacrificed for, (f) pupil, and (g) inheritance,—are the seven kinds of 'pure' wealth : and the result of these is also pure.*

Of these, *learning* and *austerities* are the sources that bring presents. Though 'present' constitutes only one kind of wealth, yet it has been mentioned as *two,* on account of its twofold source. The qualifications of the persons making the gifts have also to be borne in mind. If the giver does not happen to be absolutely objectionable, the wealth derived from him is also *pure.*—The terms '*person sacrificed for*' and '*pupil*' indicate the work of *officiating at sacrifices* and *teaching.*—'*Inherited,*' from one's forefathers.—'*Bride,*' what is obtained from the Father-in-law, at the time of marriage.—'*Bravery*'—for the *Kṣattriya* ; while the 'bride' and 'inheritance,' are common to all men.

II. *What is derived by—(a) usury—(b) agriculture, (c) trade, (d) art (e) service, (f) attendance, and (g) from a person who has been helped ;—these seven kinds of wealth are called 'mixed.'....*

'*Service*' consists of running on errands and obeying orders; while '*attendance*' is agreeable behaviour. Of these, 'usury,' 'agriculture' and 'trade' are *mixed* only for the *non-Vaishya*; for the *Vaishya*, these are commendable. Similarly, 'service,' consisting of attending upon twice-born men, is commendable for the *Shūdra*; the others are not commended for him. What is meant by these being 'mixed' is, that the results obtained from acts, performed with wealth derived from those sources, are transitory; these results lasting only during the present life.

III. *What is obtained by—(a) bribery, (b) gambling, (c) stealing, (d) causing pain to others, (e) hypocrisy, (f) robbery and (g) fraud;—all this has been declared to be 'black.'*

'*Pārshvika*,'—the man at one's side, obtains wealth by means of bribery, etc. For instance, having come to know that a person is going to obtain some wealth, one goes over to him and says, 'I shall get you so much wealth, you should give me something out of it,' and then receives it from him; the man not having done anything himself, nor having anything done by others, but simply looking on, and yet receiving money; or when one receives some consideration for standing surety for a borrower.—'*Pratirūpaka*' is pretence, hypocrisy.—'*Fraud*'—when one sells the *kusumbha* flower, in place of saffron.—'*Ārti*' is causing pain to others.—'*Stealing*' is taking away things by stealth; and '*robbery*' is taking away by force.

"As a matter of fact, stealing and robbery do not produce *ownership* at all, these not having been mentioned, among the means of acquiring it, in Gautama 10.39—'One becomes an owner by inheritance, purchase, partition, presents and trade;' or, in Manu (10.116)—'Learning, Art, Service,' etc; or, again, Manu (10.115)—'Seven sources of wealth are legal, etc.' If it be argued that these same assertions indicate Theft and Robbery also as sources of wealth—then, what would be the meaning of the assertion—'What is eaten by force, cannot be digested.'"

Some people offer the following explanation :—'*Dyūta-chauryārti*' (Gambling, Theft, Causing pain to others) is not the right reading; the right reading being '*vairyārti*' (enmity, causing pain). At the time of making peace with an enemy, one says, 'I shall make peace with you only if you give me so much;' and the other party, being helpless, gives what is asked for.—The term, *sāhasa*, does not stand for *robbery*, but for *rashness*; when, for instance, one earns wealth even at the risk of one's life; *e g.*, by going on boats, or by selling things prohibited by the king.

Others, however, opine as follows :—'Ownership' by robbery is not incompatible with the assertion regarding 'not digesting;' because force is employed only at the first act of snatching, and, after that, even when there is no force used, and the wealth is obtained and enjoyed merely by the indifference of the other party, there does come about actual *ownership*. And, as for the assertion that it is not digested, this refers to the case where voilence is used from beginning to end. Thus there is no incompatability between the two.

The right view on this point is as follows :—Real ownership is not brought about by Theft and Robbery, because of the different reading suggested; and also because other Smṛti-writers have not mentioned these among the means of acquiring weath.—(226)

SECTION XIV—CHARITY.

VERSE CCXXVII.

HE SHALL PRACTISE, TO THE BEST OF HIS ABILITY, CHARITY AND RIGHTEOUSNESS IN CONNECTION WITH SACRIFICES AND ACTS OF PIETY WITH A CHEERFUL HEART, IF HE FINDS A SUITABLE RECIPIENT.—(227)

Bhāṣya.

'*Charity* and *Righteousness*'—in the form of tanks, etc; the compound being construed as a Copulative one. Or, it may be explained as 'the duty of *charity*;' the mention of duty indicating the necessity of maintaining a cheerful disposition.

'*Bhāvēna*'—with the heart; *parituṣṭēna*—cheerful, happy—'*If he finds a suitable recipient*, he shall offer gifts in connection with the observances that he keeps, as also in connection with the acts that he does outside the sacrificial altar.—(227)

VERSE CCXXVIII.

WHEN ASKED, HE SHOULD GIVE SOMETHING, WITHOUT SHOWING ANY DISPLEASURE. BECAUSE HE MAY TURN OUT TO BE A WORTHY RECIPIENT WHO WILL SAVE HIM FROM EVERYTHING.—(228)

Bhāṣya.

'*Something*'—however little—shall be given by one who is '*asked*,' begged. If there is some doubt,—and no certainty—as to the person being a worthy or unworthy recipient, some little thing, not much, should be given. The idea, that much shall not be given, is due to a direct assertion to that effect, in connection with doubtful cases.

It is just possible that the man may turn out to be a worthy recipient;—What sort of recipient?—'*One who will save him from*'—guard him against—'*everything*'—all kinds of sin that lead men to hell.

It has been said under 3.96 that gifts are to be offered to 'one who knows the Veda and its meaning;' and to that the present verse is an exception, providing for small gifts being offered in cases of doubtful worthiness of the recipient.—(228)

VERSE CCXXIX.

THE GIVER OF WATER OBTAINS SATISFACTION, THE GIVER OF FOOD IMPERISHABLE HAPPINESS, THE GIVER OF SESAMUM DESIRABLE OFFSPRING, AND THE GIVER OF LAMP MOST EXCELLENT EYE-SIGHT.—(229)

Bhāṣya

'*Satisfaction*,'—non-suffering from hunger and thirst. This is possible only for the wealthy and the healthy. So that great wealth and good health are the results declared as following from the giving of water.

'*Imperishable happiness.*' —In the absence of any specification, the 'happiness' meant here is understood to stand for the *means of happiness*. '*Imperishable*'—lasting throughout life.

'*Giver of food*'—cooked,—*saktu*, rice, etc.,—as well as *raw*, rice, etc.

The '*Lamp*' is given—either at crossings or in a place where Brāhmaṇas assemble—(229).

VERSE CCXXX.

THE GIVER OF LAND OBTAINS LAND, THE GIVER OF GOLD LONG LIFE, THE GIVER OF HOUSE EXCELLENT MANSIONS, AND THE GIVER OF SILVER EXQUISITE BEAUTY.—(230)

Bhāṣya

He obtains possession of land.

'*Hiraṇya*' is *gold*.

The giver of silver obtains exquisite beauty.—(230)

VERSE CCXXXI.

THE GIVER OF CLOTH OBTAINS RESEMBLANCE TO THE MOON, THE GIVER OF HORSE RESEMBLANCE TO HORSE-OWNERS, THE GIVER OF THE OX GREAT GOOD FORTUNE, AND THE GIVER OF THE COW THE REGION OF THE SUN.—(231)

Bhāṣya.

He comes to look like—just as pleasing to look at as—the Moon. According to the Purāṇas, the meaning would be that he reaches that particular region in Heaven which is called the 'Region of the Moon.'

'*Resemblance to horse-owners*;—*i.e.*, he obtains many horses. According to the Purāṇa,—'he obtains the region of the Ashwins.'

'*Ox*' is the male animal, capable of pulling carts; he who gives this, obtains '*great good fortune*';—*i.e.*, acquires excellent cattle, sheep, riches and grain.

'*Bradhna*' is the *Sun*; he obtains the region of the Sun; *i.e.*, he becomes endowed with great effulgence, superior to everything else. Or, the '*region of the Sun*' may stand for Heaven.

Another Smṛti-text (Yājñavalkya, Achara, 204) describes special results arising from the giving of particular kinds of cows:—'A milch cow, with golden horns and silvered hoofs, quiet and covered with cloth, shall be given, along with a *kāmsya* vessel, accompanied with a proper fee.' If we read '*sa-dakṣiṇā*,' the meaning will be that gold and other things shall be given as additional gifts. Or, we may read '*su*' for '*sa*' (*i. e.*, '*sudakṣiṇā*),' meaning *beautiful*; the meaning being that the cow given, as also the presents, shall be *excellent*.—'*kāmsyopadohā* is another reading for '*sakāmsyapatra*;' '*kāmsya*' standing for a particular measure; and the cow should give that much milk; *i.e.*, she should give a large quantity of milk.

Further details of procedure have been laid down in other texts; such as—'Her tail shall be adorned with pearls, the ground shall be covered with silver,' and so forth; and these have to be observed by men desiring special results; as described in the text—'The tawny cow with calf saves

one's forefathers up to the seventh degree, and the double-faced cow (one just giving birth to a calf) for the same number of cycles as there are hairs on her body. The result here mentioned follows from the giving of the tawny cow; the double-faced cow, when given, leads to Heaven, for as many 'thousand years' as there are hairs on her body;—'*saves*' stands for *freeing from sin.*

In the Mahābhārata, the giving of the cow has been described as bringing all kinds of rewards.

The giving of water, etc., also is found mentioned as bringing all kinds of rewards—'Having given land, cattle, food, clothes, water, sesamum, butter, shelter, houses and gold—one shines in Heaven.' '*Naivēshika*' means *House.*—(231)

VERSE CCXXXII.

THE GIVER OF CARRIAGE AND COUCH OBTAINS A WIFE, THE GIVER OF FEARLESSNESS SOVEREIGNTY, THE GIVER OF GRAINS ETERNAL HAPPINESS, AND THE GIVER OF THE VEDA EQUALITY WITH BRAHMAN.—(232)

Bhāṣya.

'*Sovereignty*,'—the position of the master, lordship.

'*Happiness*'—being happy.

'*Grains*'—such as *Vrīhi*, *Māṣa*, *Mudga*, and so forth. In connection with the giving of sesamum, another result has been described.

'*Brahman*' means *Veda*; '*ṛṣṭi*' is *condition*;—'*sārṣṭi*' is one who has the same condition;—the change of '*samāna*' into '*sa*' being the Vedic form;—'*ṛṣṭi*' is derived from the root '*ṛṣi*,' to 'go;'—or '*sārṣṭi*' may mean the character of *acting*. In another case, the meaning is that he obtains 'equality' with—the same condition of existence as—Brahman.—(232)

VERSE CCXXXIII.

THE GIVING OF VEDA SURPASSES ALL GIFTS OF WATER, FOOD, COWS, BUFFALOES, CLOTHES, SESAMUM, GOLD AND CLARIFIED BUTTER.—(233)

Bhāṣya.

This is a commendatory supplement to the foregoing injunction.

The term '*dāna*' stands for *things given*, *gifts*, or for the *act* of giving.

'*Giving of Veda.*'—Studying and expounding the Veda. It is superior to the giving of every other thing, in the shape of *water*, etc.—(233)

VERSE CCXXXIV.

IN WHATEVER SPIRIT A MAN BESTOWS A GIFT, IN THAT SAME SPIRIT HE HIMSELF RECEIVES IT WITH DUE HONOUR.—(234)

Bhāṣya.

The tern '*bhāva*,' '*spirit*,' denotes *mental disposition*. In whatever spirit—with a pleasant mind, proper faith and respect—one bestows a gift, in that same spirit he himself obtains it; if, on the other hand, he gives without faith, in a disrespectful manner and after having insulted the recipient,—then he himself also obtains it in the same manner.

The phrase, '*yadyat*,' '*whatever*,' does not refer to the *kinds of things* (given as gifts).—"What, then, is the use of the expression?"—The explanation is that the phrase means that 'the man obtains the pleasures brought about by the substances concerned.' If the objects themselves were meant, then, in the case of a man giving medicines to a sick person, he would obtain (as reward) that same medicine; and, since such a reward would be of no use to a healthy person, it would be thrown away. For this reason, the meaning must be that 'the giver obtains the same kind of pleasure that he causes by his gift;' so that the gift of medicines would bring sound health to the giver.

Or, the term '*bhāva*, '*spirit*,' may stand for *desire*, *purpose*, the idea 'may this be mine;' the sense of the passage in that case would be—'the man obtains that same reward,

with a view to obtaining which he bestows the gift,'— and that '*in the same spirit*;' *i.e.*, he obtains it at the same time at which he happens to be in want of it. This implies that the gift of all things may bring to the giver all kinds of rewards.—(234)

VERSE CCXXXV.

HE WHO RECEIVES RESPECTFULLY, AS WELL AS HE WHO GIVES RESPECTFULLY,—BOTH THESE GO TO HEAVEN; BUT TO HELL, IN THE CONTRARY CASE.—(235)

Bhāṣya.

Gifts should be bestowed with respect; they should be received also in the same manner. The sense of the verse is that gifts shall not be bestowed in a disrespectful manner.

'*Architam*,' '*respectfully*,' is an adverb.—(235)

SECTION XV—AVOID PIOUS VANITY.

VERSE CCXXXVI.

HE SHALL NOT BE PROUD OF HIS AUSTERITIES; HAVING OFFERED A SACRIFICE, HE SHALL NOT UTTER A LIE; EVEN WHEN TORMENTED, HE SHALL NOT REVILE THE BRĀHMAṆAS; HAVING BESTOWED A GIFT, HE SHALL NOT ADVERTISE IT.—(236)

Bhāṣya.

When he performs an austerity, he shall not boast of it,—'I have performed a most severe austerity, extremely difficult to perform;' he shall not entertain any such idea.

'*Having performed a sacrifice, he shall not utter a lie.*'—Though *lying* in general has been forbidden, in connection with what is desirable for men, yet it is forbidden again, with a view to indicate that the avoidance of untruth is an essential factor in sacrifices also; and that, if there is a transgression of this, the performance of the *Jyotiṣṭoma*, etc., would become defective.

'*Tormented*'—by the Brāhmaṇas—'*he shall not revile*'—abuse, speak ill of—them.

'*Having bestowed a gift*'—in the form of the cow and such other things,—'*he shall not advertise it*' before another person, saying, 'Such and such a gift has been bestowed by me.'—(236)

VERSE CCXXXVII.

THE SACRIFICE TRICKLES AWAY BY FALSEHOOD, THE AUSTERITY TRICKLES AWAY BY VANITY, LONGEVITY BY THE REVILING OF BRĀHMAṆAS, AND GIFTS BY ADVERTISEMENT.—(237)

Bhāṣya.

This is supplementary to the foregoing Prohibition. By reason of 'falsehood,' *the sacrifice trickles away*'—*i e.*, becomes fruitless; the purpose for which it was performed is not accomplished. Similarly, throughout the verse.—(237)

SECTION XVI—ACCUMULATE SPIRITUAL MERIT.

VERSE CCXXXVIII.

WITHOUT CAUSING PAIN TO ANY BEINGS, HE SHALL, FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING A COMPANION IN THE OTHER WORLD, ACCUMULATE SPIRITUAL MERIT, SLOWLY ; JUST AS THE WHITE ANTS ACCUMULATE THE ANT-HILL.—(238)

Bhāṣya.

If one is unable to bestow a large gift, or perform a difficult austerity, or offer an elaborate sacrifice—like the *Jyotiṣṭoma* and the rest,—he should not be despondent on that account ; on the contrary, he should '*slowly*' and gently 'accumulate spiritual merit,' by means of small gifts, small austerities, by helping others, to the best of his ability, and by muttering prayers and offering oblations prescribed in the *Smṛtis* ; just in the same manner in which white ants accumulate the *ant-hill.*

'*For the purpose of obtaining a companion in the other world.*'—This describes the fruits of spiritual merit.

'*Without causing pain to any beings* ;' *i.e.*, even for the sake of spiritual merit, he shall not go about begging and thereby causing pain to others.—(238)

VERSE CCXXXIX.

THERE, NEITHER FATHER, NOR MOTHER, NOR WIFE, NOR SONS, NOR RELATIONS STAY AS COMPANIONS ; SPIRITUAL MERIT ALONE REMAINS.—(239)

Bhāṣya.

This only describes the real state of things.

'*There,*'—*i.e.*, during next birth—'*as companions,*'—*i.e.*, for saving him from the pangs of hell, etc ; friends and relations have no power ; the only thing that saves him is the spiritual merit that he has acquired during life.—(239)

VERSE CCXXXX.

ALONE IS A CREATURE BORN, AND ALONE DOES IT CEASE TO BE; ALONE IT ENJOYS ITS GOOD DEEDS AND ALSO ITS EVIL DEEDS.—(239)

Bhāṣya.

'*Each creature*'—living being—'*is born alone,*'—and not along with his friends and relations; and '*alone does it cease to be;*' friends and relations do not die with him. Even when one's wife, or some other devoted person, kills herself at the time of one's death, this act of *dying* is different from that of the man's own dying; and, by this act, the wife does not become born in the same womb with the husband, in the way in which Atri was born.

Similarly, his good and evil deeds also the man enjoys himself.

"It has been said that neither one's wife nor one's sons help him; but, as a matter of fact, the son does help the father, by performing the *shrāddha* and other rites; and so the wife also."

True; but all that this means is that such a dutiful son is born only to a person who has acquired merit; and, just as during life, one is helped by another person who supports him by the hand, so also, when the man dies, his son helps him by means of religious acts.—(240)

VERSE CCXXXXI.

LEAVING THE DEAD BODY ON THE GROUND, LIKE A LOG OF WOOD OR A CLOD OF EARTH, THE RELATIONS DEPART WITH AVERTED FACES; SPIRITUAL MERIT ALONE FOLLOWS HIM.—(241)

Bhāṣya.

'*Follows*'—accompanies.

This verse describes what is actually seen to happen. Relations throw away the body of the dead man on the ground, just as if it were a log of wood, or a clod of earth, and go away, with their faces turned away; but Spiritual Merit alone follows the man.—(241)

VERSE CCXXXXII.

HE SHALL, THEREFORE, SLOWLY ACCUMULATE SPIRITUAL MERIT, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SECURING A COMPANION; FOR, WITH MERIT AS HIS COMPANION, THE MAN CROSSES OVER UNFORDABLE DARKNESS.—(242)

Bhāṣya.

This is a recapitulation.

'*Unfordable darkness*'—*i.e.*, that which is crossed over with difficulty.

'*Darkness*' stands for *suffering*. Even such '*unfordable darkness*' becomes easily fordable with the aid of Merit as a companion; *i.e.*, the man does not become submerged in the darkness.—(242)

VERSE CCXXXXIII.

IT SPEEDILY CARRIES THE MAN, WHO IS DEVOTED TO DUTY AND HAS HIS SINS DESTROYED BY AUSTERITIES, CLOTHED IN HIS OWN (SPIRITUAL) BODY, TO THE BRIGHTER REGIONS ABOVE.—(243)

Bhāṣya.

'*Dharmapradhānam*'—means 'he for whom Duty is the main consideration'; *i.e.*, he who is devoted to duty, and performs all acts exactly as they are enjoined.

'*Who has his sins destroyed by austerities.*'—If he happens to commit any transgressions, through carelessness, his sin is destroyed by the expiatory austerities he performs. The evil having arisen out of his transgression of the law, it is effaced by the proper expiatory rites.

'*It carries him to the brighter regions above,*'—*i.e.*, the effulgent rgions of the gods, in the shape of Heaven, etc.

Who carries him?

Dharma, or Spiritual Merit. That this is so, is clear from the context.

'*Clothed in his own body.*'—The Soul being in *its own body,* and not in the body made up of material substances, as ordinary souls are, his body is his own spiritual one; which means that he is as all-pervading as Brahman, the Supreme Spirit.—(243)

SECTION XVII.—RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS.

VERSE CCXXXIV.

BEING DESIROUS OF RAISING HIS FAMILY TO EMINENCE, HE SHALL ALWAYS FORM CONNECTIONS WITH SUPERIOR KINDS OF PEOPLE; HE SHALL AVOID ALL INFERIOR ONES.—(244)

Bhāṣya.

The word, '*uttamaiḥ*,' has been repeated, in view of the fact that there are several kinds of 'superior' people; some are 'superior' in *caste*, some in *learning*, some in *character*. Or, the repetition may be due to diversity of connections; some connections being desirable for some kinds of 'superior' people, and some with the other.

'*With superior people*'—with people superior in caste, etc.,—'*he shall form connections*' of marriage, etc.

'*Being desirous of raising his family to eminence*'—to a superior status.

'*He shall avoid the inferior kinds.*'—The injunction that connections shall be formed with superior people, implies that those with inferior people shall be avoided; the emphasizing of this latter, therefore, is meant to permit the forming of connections with middle class people, if superior people are not available.

'*Inferior*'—low.—(244)

VERSE CCXXXV.

HAVING RECOURSE TO SUPERIOR KINDS OF PEOPLE, AND AVOIDING THE INFERIOR KINDS, THE BRĀHMAṆA ATTAINS EMINENCE; BY THE CONTRARY PROCEDURE, HE BECOMES A SHŪDRA.—(245)

Bhāṣya.

'*Having recourse to superior people;*'—*i.e.*, forming connections with them,—'*the Brāhmaṇa attains eminence.*' The

term, '*brāhmaṇa*,' standing for the *Kṣattriya* and the *Vaishya* also.

'*By the contrary procedure*,'—by adopting the opposite process—*i.e.*, by forming connections with inferior people—the man becomes a *Shūdra*. Since it is not possible for the caste of a man to disappear, what is meant is that he becomes *equal to the Shūdra*.—(245)

VERSE CCXXXXVI.

HE WHO ACTS RESOLUTELY, IS GENTLE AND TOLERANT, WHO DOES NOT ASSOCIATE WITH PERSONS OF CRUEL DISPOSITION, AND WHO DOES NO INJURY TO OTHERS, SHALL WIN HEAVEN BY HIS SELF-CONTROL AND LIBERALITY, IF HE STICKS TO THIS PRACTICE.—(246)

Bhāṣya.

'*Who acts resolutely*,'—*i. e.*, he who is firm in his determination to do something ; having undertaken an act, he is sure to finish it ; having begun an act, he does not desist ; *i.e.*, who is not un-determined. This is what is asserted in such passages as—' going to the end of what has been begun, etc., etc.'

'*Gentle*'—not hard-hearted.

'*Has no connection with men of cruel conduct*'—such as thieves and others.

'*By means of self-control and liberality, he wins heaven*'—'*if he sticks to this practice* ;'—*i.e.*, observing the said rules.

'*Self-control*' being mentioned separately, the term, '*dāntaḥ*,' should be taken to mean 'tolerant of opposition.'—(246)

SECTION XVIII—ACCEPTING OF GIFTS.

VERSE CCXXXXVII.

HE MAY ACCEPT FROM ALL PERSONS FUEL, WATER, ROOTS, AND FRUITS, AND FOOD THAT IS OFFERED, AS ALSO HONEY AND THE GIFT OF FEARLESSNESS.—(247)

Bhāṣya.

'*Fuel*'—the wood, etc, to burn.

'*Food*'—either cooked or raw.

'*Offered*'—presented before him.

All this may be accepted from all persons ;—*i.e.*, even from *Shūdras*, or persons who may have committed minor sins ; only avoiding the outcast, the accused, the Chāṇḍāla and other low castes mixed in the reverse order.

'*Madhu*'—Honey.

'*Gift of fearlessness.*'—Fearlessness is the form of a gift. This is mentioned by way of illustration. In fact, the 'acceptance of a gift' consists in accepting something which another person voluntarily offers ; and the 'possession of fearlessness' is not of this kind ; as, in this case, no one's ownership ceases, nor is any one's ownership produced (as there is in all cases of giving and gifts). It is for this reason that the term, 'gift,' has been used in this connection, only by way of eulogising the said promise. The meaning is that—'just as, when one is passing through a forest or jungle, there is no harm in acceptiong the protection offered even by Chāṇḍālas, robbers, and such other persons, so also there is nothing objectionable in the accepting of fuel and the other things mentioned here.'

The rule here laid down applies to normal times ; it is going to be declared later* on that in abnormal times of distress, one may accept gifts even from Chaṇḍālas and others.

The term, '*offered,*' is, through proximity, to be construed with '*food*' only, not with '*fuel*' and the rest. Hence, in connection with these latter, even begging is not objectionable.

The general rule being—'gifts should be accepted only from righteous twice-born persons,' no one would think of accepting them from either unrighteous twice-born persons, or from *Shūdras*. But, in the case of certain things (fuel, etc.), begging is considered desirable. Hence the present text—(247)

VERSE CCXXXVIII.

ALMS BROUGT FORWARD AND OFFERED, AND NOT PREVIOUSLY BEGGED, PRAJĀPATI HAS DECLARED TO BE ACCEPTABLE, EVEN FROM A SINFUL PERSON.—(248).

Bhāṣya.

This verse asserts the acceptability of even things other than fuel and the rest (mentioned in the preceding verse).

The term '*bhikṣā,*' '*alms,*' has been used in an appreciatory sense; and it is not stricIty *alms* that is meant here; though, in reality, the term '*alms*' denotes *a small quantity of cooked food,*—and it is on account of smallness of its quantity that its acceptance is not regarded as open to serious objection; specially as, for the Student, it has been permitted as coming from all castes. And what is meant by the present text is that other things also may be treated on the same footing. The term 'alms' is often found to be used in this sense; *e.g.*, in the *Mahābhārata* (1.206.1)—'The two high-souled sons of Pṛthā went to Pṛthā at the carpenter's shop and joyously informed her of their having received *Draupadi* as *alms.*'

'*Brought forward*'—to that place where the recipient stands.

'*Offered*'—placed before the recipient, who is told, either by a gesture, or with actual words, to accept it.

'*Previously*'—at any previous time.

'*Not begged*,'—not asked for by the recipient; nor promised by the giver, either directly, or through some one else, to the effect that,—'such and such a thing there is in my house; please have the kindness to accept it;' only what is offered without premeditation, actually thought of at the moment itself.

Such alms '*Prajāpati*'—Hiraṇyagarbha—*has declared*,—what?—*to be acceptable even from a sinful person*,—the sinful person being one whose actions are sinful—(248)

VERSE CCXXXXIX.

OF THE MAN THAT DISDAINS IT, THE PITṚS DO NO EAT ANY FOOD FOR TEN AND FIVE YEARS; NOR DOES FIRE CONVEY HIS OFFERING TO THE GODS.—(249)

Bhāṣya.

This is an imaginary assertion, deprecating the non-acceptance of the said gifts.

That person who disdains, refuses to accept it,—his *Shrāddha* the '*Pitṛs do not eat*'—do no accept; nor does Fire convey his offerings to the gods. That is, such a man does not derive any benefit from rites performed for the *Pitṛs* or for the gods.

In this connection, some one has asserted that—"Even though what is offered happens to be of no use, it should be accepted, as a favour to the giver."

This, however, is not right; as all that the text means is that gift, offered unasked, may be accepted without harm; and what is said here is a counter-exception, and there can be 'counter-exception' only in favour of what has been forbidden; so that, what may be had recourse to by reason of ordinary want having been forbidden (by a previous text), the present text lays down a counter-exception.—(249)

VERSE CCL.

HE SHALL NOT REFUSE A COUCH, A HOUSE, KUSHA GRASS, PERFUMES, WATER, FLOWERS, JEWELS, CURD, GRAIN, FISH, MILK, MEAT AND VEGETABLES.—(250)

Bhāṣya.

The *couch* and other things one should not refuse to accept, even when they are not actually presented before him. That is, if some one were to come and say, 'I have these things in my house ; do please come and accept them,'—then these should not be rejected.—(250).

VERSE CCLI.

FOR THE PURPOSE OF BRINGING RELIEF TO HIS TEACHERS AND DEPENDENTS, AND FOR THE PURPOSE OF HONORING THE GODS AND GUESTS, HE MAY ACCEPT GIFTS FROM ALL PERSONS ; BUT HE SHALL NOT DERIVE FROM THEM SATISFACTION FOR HIMSELF.—(251)

Bhāṣya.

'*Teachers* ;'—the plural form is used, in view of some persons teaching directly, and others only indirectly, by implication.

'*Dependents,*'—those who have a right to be maintained by him ; these are enumerated in another *Smṛti* text as follows :—'Aged parents, the well-conducted wife and the infant child.' '*For the purpose of bringing relief to these*'—when they are suffering from hunger ;—'*and for the purpose of honouring the gods and guests* ;— that is, for the sake of due accomplishment of his daily duties.

'*He may accept gifts from all persons*'—good or bad.

'*But he shall not derive from them satisfaction for himself.*'—'*Satisfaction*' here stands for *relieving hunger* and other forms of enjoyment ; these he shall not do. That is, such gifts shall be accepted only for the sake of Teachers and others, and never for his own sake.—(251)

" How, then, is the man to maintain himself ? " In answer to this, we have the following:—

VERSE CCLII.

WHEN, HOWEVER, THE TEACHERS ARE DEAD, OR WHEN ONE LIVES IN HIS HOUSE WITHOUT THEM,—THEN, SEEKING FOR HIS OWN SUBSISTENCE, HE MAY ALWAYS ACCEPT GIFTS FROM GOOD PERSONS.—(252)

Bhāṣya.

'*Dead*'—and past; or when, even though the Teachers be living, the man lives apart from them.

The term, '*Teachers*,' here includes all *dependants* also.

'*Seeking his own subsistence*,' he shall accept gifts from '*good*'—righteous—'*persons*.' No caste being specified, acceptance is permitted from righteous *Shūdras* also; as is said under 223—'A Brāhmaṇa shall not eat, etc., etc.'—(252)

VERSE CCLIII.

HIS OWN PLOUGHMAN, HEREDITARY FRIEND, COWHERD, SLAVE AND BARBER,—AMONG SHŪDRAS; THESE ARE PERSONS WHOSE FOOD MAY BE EATEN; AS ALSO ONE WHO OFFERS HIMSELF.—(253)

Bhāṣya.

'*Ardhika*,' '*Ploughman*,' is the man who ploughs his family-holdings for him.

'*Cowherd* and *slave*'—are terms denoting relationship. One may eat food of that person who keeps his cows for him.

'*He who offers himself*;'—saying, you are my sole refuge; I live solely dependent upon you'—one who offers oneself in this manner, is also one whose food may be eaten.—(253).

VERSE CCLIV.

AS THE MAN'S CHARACTER MAY BE, AS MAY BE THE NATURE OF THE WORK HE WISHES TO DO, AND AS MAY BE THE MANNER IN WHICH HE MAY SERVE,—EVEN SO MUST HE OFFER HIMSELF.—(254)

Bhāṣya.

The text proceeds to show the manner of 'offering himself.'

'*As may be the character of the man*,'—*i.e.*, the family, the country and the profession to which the *Shūdra* concerned may belong.

'*The work he wishes to do*;'—saying, 'This is the work that I shall do under you, either as my duty, or for some other purpose, such as saving myself from being pressed for service at the royal palace, and so forth.'

'*The manner in which he may serve*;'—'I shall serve you with this act of mine;'—'I shall press your feet, and do other household work.' When one offers to do all this, then is he said to have '*offered himself*.'

Others have taken the word,' '*Ātman*' 'himself,' in the expression, '*Ātmanām nivēdayēt*,' 'offers himself,' to mean *child*—according to the text, 'thou art my own self, named *son*;' and have explained it to mean that 'one may eat the food of the *Shūdra*, whose *daughter* (*ātma*) one may have married, under the influence of sexual passion.'

This, however, is not right. The term, 'ātmā' is never used directly in the sense of *daughter*; it is only the masculine form '*putra*,' 'son,' that is often found to be so used; and there would be no useful purpose served by the Author using a term in an indirect sense; it would have been enough to say—'he who gives his daughter to him.'

Others have explained that the mention of the 'ploughman' and others is meant to be indicative of the *Shūdra* in general; so that it follows that one may eat the food of one's father-in-law of the '*Pārashava*' caste (son of a Brāhmaṇa from a *Shūdra* mother).—(254)

SECTION XIX—CONTROL OF SPEECH.

VERSE CCLV.

HE, WHO DESCRIBES HIMSELF TO GOOD MEN OTHERWISE THAN WHAT HE IS, IS THE WORST SINNER IN THE WORLD, A THIEF STEALING HIMSELF.—*(255)*

Bhāṣya.

Being of one kind,—*i.e.*, unrighteous—if he describes himself to '*good men*'—to cultured people—'*otherwise*'—describing himself as *righteous* ;—or, when he goes to a man for one purpose, and represents it to be something else,—such a person is the worst of all sinners.

'*Thief*'—stealer ;—'*stealing himself.*' Other thieves steal things, while this person steals himself. This shows the despicable character of the man.—(255)

VERSE CCLVI.

ALL THINGS ARE REGULATED BY SPEECH, HAVE THEIR ROOT IN SPEECH, AND EMANATE FROM SPEECH. THE MAN WHO STEALS SUCH SPEECH IS THE STEALER OF ALL THINGS.—(256)

Bhāṣya.

The relation between words and their denotations being eternal, things are described as '*regulated by speech.*'

'*Have their root in speech.*'—Things are said to have their root in speech, in view of the fact that the ideas of the speaker depend, for their manifestation, upon speech.

'*Emanate from speech,*'—are produced out of speech ; things are so called, because the ideas of the hearer also are dependent upon speech.

It is not necessary to suspect, or attempt an explanation of, the repetition here involved ; because what is stated here is merely a description of things as they are, and as such may be put forward in any manner possible.

Bhāṣya.

The renunciation of all acts having been accomplished, the following is his special duty:—

'*Alone*,'—without a companion,—having no one to talk to—'*in solitude*'—in a place where there is no one, and which is free from all disturbance,—'*he shall meditate upon what is good for himself*'; *i.e.*, should practise that 'contemplation of the Brahman' which has been enjoined in the *Upaniṣads*.

By means of this practice and meditation, he obtains the highest good—called 'Liberation.'—(258)

SECTION XXI—SUMMING UP.

VERSE CCLIX.

THUS HAS BEEN DESCRIBED THE ETERNAL COURSE OF LIFE OF THE BRĀHMAṆA-HOUSEHOLDER, AS ALSO THE SERIES OF OBSERVANCES FOR THE ACCOMPLISHED STUDENT, WHICH IS CONDUCIVE TO THE INCREASE OF THE QUALITY OF GOODNESS, AND IS PRAISEWORTHY.— (259)

Bhāṣya.

This sums up the contents of the whole Discourse :—

"*Thus has been described the enternal course of life of the Householder,*"—the 'non-eternal' one being that which shall be described in connection with abnormal times.

The addition of the term, '*Brāhmaṇa,*' indicates that the observances laid down are for the Brāhmaṇa Accomplished Student.

'*Goodness*'—is a quality of the soul; and it is conducive to the increase of this quality.

'*Praiseworthy*'—excellent. All this is mere praise.—(259)

VERSE CCLX.

THE BRĀHMAṆA, LEARNED IN THE VEDIC SCRIPTURES, WHO CONDUCTS HIMSELF BY THIS COURSE OF LIFE, HAS HIS SINS REMOVED, AND REMAINS FOR EVER EXALTED IN THE REGION OF BRAHMAN.—(260)

Bhāṣya.

This describes the result of all that has gone before.

'*The Brāhmaṇa, learned in the Vedic scriptures, who conducts himself by this course of life, has his sins*'—arising from doing what is forbidden—'*removed*'—by means of Expiatory Rites. The meaning is that by doing what is enjoined, and by avoiding what is forbidden, and by expiating by means of rites those sins that may happen to be committed,—'*becomes exalted in the region of Brahman*;—or, according to another theory, he becomes of the same nature as Brahman.—(260)

THUS ENDS DISCOURSE IV.